



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 29] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जुलाई 21, 1973/आषाढ़ 30, 1895
No 29] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JULY 21, 1973/ASADHA 30, 1895

इस भाग में निम्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर)
केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गये विधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities
(other than the Administration of Union Territories)

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग
आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 22 मई, 1973

का. आ. 1994.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए निर्वाचन के लिए 176-अदोनी सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सिवसंकराया, मेलागवल्ली (पो.) तालुक अलुर, (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त, उम्मीदवार द्वारा दिये गये अभ्यावेदन पर विचार करने के पश्चात्, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री सिवसंकराया को संसद के

किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

[सं. आ. प्र.वि.स./176/72]

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd May, 1973

S.O. 1994.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Sivasankarayya, Melagavalli (P.O.), Alur taluk (Andhra Pradesh) a contesting candidate for the general election to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly held in March, 1972 from 176-Adoni constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner required by the Representation of the people Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, after considering the representation made by the said candidate, the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri

Sivasankarayya to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. AP-LA/176/72]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 20 जून, 1973

का. आ. 1995.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए पश्चिमी बंगाल विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 135-कबीरथि निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मोहम्मदुल हसन अयुब, 16/1 बी, तपसिया साउथ रोड, कलकत्ता-46 लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री मोहम्मदुल हसन अयुब को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

[सं. प. बं.-वि.स./135/72(67)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 20th June, 1973

S.O. 1995.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mohammadul Hasan Ayub, 16/1B, Tapsia South Road, Calcutta-46, a contesting candidate for election to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly from 135-Kabirthi constituency, held in March 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mohammadul Hasan Ayub to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. WB-LA/135/72(67)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 जून, 1973

का. आ. 1996.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए पश्चिमी बंगाल विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 240-विष्णुपुर सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सन्तोष कुमार आचार्य, बैलापाड़ा, जिला बाँकुरा (पश्चिमी बंगाल) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री सन्तोष कुमार आचार्य को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

[सं. प. बं.-वि.स./240/72(73)]

ए. एन. सैन, सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd June, 1973

S.O. 1996.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Santosh Kumar Acharya, Bailapara, P. O. Vishnupur, District Bankura (West Bengal) a contesting candidate for election to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly from 240-Vishnupur constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Santosh Kumar Acharya to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. WB-LA/240/72(73)]

A. N. SEN, Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 19 जून, 1973

का. आ. 1997.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए महाराष्ट्र विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 166-बासमथ निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री गजभर जनार्दन, बुद्धवाडा बासमथ, पी. बासमथ, तालुक बासमथ, जिला परभनी (महाराष्ट्र) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ।

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री गजभर जनार्दन को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

[सं. महारा.-वि.स./166/72(32)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 19th June, 1973

S.O. 1997.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Gajbhar Janardhan, Budhwada Basmath, Post Basmath, Taluka Basmath, District Parbhani (Maharashtra), a contesting candidate in the general election held in March, 1972, to the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly from 166-Basmath constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses, as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Gajbhar Janardhan to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MT-LA/166/72(32)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 जून, 1973

का. आ. 1998.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 49-तल्लारेवु (अ. जा.) निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री रामन्ना कटरू, गोवालन्का, हेमलेट्ट पिल्लान्का, पिल्लान्का पोस्ट (बरास्ता) यानाम, काकिनदा तालुक (आन्ध्र प्रदेश), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचनाएँ दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री रामन्ना कटरू को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

[सं. आ. प्र.-वि. स./49/72]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd June, 1973

S.O. 1998.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ramanna Katru, Govalanka, Hiamlet of Pillanka, Pillanka Post (Via) Yanam, Kakinada Taluk (Andhra Pradesh), a contesting candidate for the general election held in March, 1972 to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 49. Tallarevu (SC) constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ramanna Katru to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. AP-LA/49/72]

आदेश

का. आ. 1999.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 100-गुन्टूर निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री अमीर बंग, आनन्व पेट, गुन्टूर (आन्ध्र प्रदेश), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचनाएँ दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री अमीर बंग को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

[सं. आ. प्र.-वि. स./100/72]

ORDER

S.O. 1999.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ameer Baig, Anandapet, Guntur (Andhra Pradesh), a contesting candidate for the general election to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 100-Guntur-I constituency, held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ameer Baig to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. AP-LA/100/72]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 जून, 1973

का. आ. 2000.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 47-सम्पारा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री नन्दीपती बुराया उर्फ लक्ष्मणस्वामी, पन्डूरू, ता. ककिनदा, जिला पूर्वी गोदावरी (आ. प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों

द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचनाएँ दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री नन्दीपती बुराय्या उर्फ लक्ष्मणस्वामी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

[सं. आ. प्र.-वि. स./47/72]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th June, 1973

S.O. 2000.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Nandipati Burayya, alias Lakshmanaswamy, Panduru, Kakinada Taluk, East Godavari District (Andhra Pradesh), a contesting candidate for the general election held in March, 1972, to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 47-Sampara constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Nandipati Burayya alias Lakshmanaswamy, to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. AP-LA/47/72]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 27 जून, 1973

का. आ. 2001.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए निर्वाचन के लिए 51-रामचन्द्रपुरम निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री नुन्ना वेंकटरंगरेड्डी नायडू, द्रक्षरामा, तालुक रामचन्द्रपुरम, जिला पूर्वी गोदावरी (आ. प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचनाएँ दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री नुन्ना वेंकटरंगरेड्डी नायडू को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा

विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

[सं. आ. प्र.-वि. स./51/72]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 27th June, 1973

S.O. 2001.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Nunna Venkatarreddi Naidu, Draksharama, Ramachandrapuram Taluk, East Godavari District (Andhra Pradesh), a contesting candidate for the general election held in March, 1972, to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 51, Ramachandrapuram constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Nunna Venkatarreddi Naidu to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. AP-LA/51/72]

आदेश

का. आ. 2002.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए निर्वाचन के लिए 53-चेय्येरु सभा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री सीथाराम राजू सारीपल्ला, चिपाल पालम, हैमलट-मुम्मीदिवारम, जिला पूर्वी गोदावरी (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचनाएँ दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री सीथाराम राजू सारीपल्ला को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरर्हित घोषित करता है ।

[सं. आ. प्र.-वि. स./53/72]

ORDER

S.O. 2002.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Seethyaramaraju Sripella, Chippalapalaem, Hamlet of Mummidivaram, East Godavari District, (Andhra Pradesh), a contesting candidate for the general election held in March, 1972 to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 53-Cheyyeru constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Seetharamaraju Saripella to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. AP-LA/53/72]

आदेश

का. आ. 2003.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए आन्ध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए निर्वाचन के लिए 54-अल्लवारम (अजा) निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री पारामत्ता वीरा राधाबुल्लु, थान्दवल्ली, अमलपुरम तालुक, जिला-पूर्वी गोदावरी, (अन्ध्र प्रदेश) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, उक्त, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री पारामत्ता वीरा राधाबुल्लु को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहिता घोषित करता है ।

[सं. आ. प्र.वि. स./54/72]

ORDER

S.O. 2003.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Paramata Veera Raghavulu, Thandavapalli, Amalapuram Taluk, East Godavari District (Andhra Pradesh), a contesting candidate for the general election held in March, 1972, to the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 54, Allavaram (SC) constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Paramata Veera Raghavulu to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. AP-LA/54/72]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 29 जून, 1973

का. आ. 2004.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए महाराष्ट्र विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 97-लोनर निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मपरी साहेबराव भाऊराव, पोस्ट लोनर, तालुक मेहकर, जिला बुलढाना, महाराष्ट्र, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री मपरी साहेबराव भाऊराव को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहिता घोषित करता है ।

[सं. महा.वि. स./97/72(34)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 29th June, 1973

S.O. 2004.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mapari Sahebrao Bhaurao, At & Post Lonar, Taluka Mehkar, District Buldana (Maharashtra), a contesting candidate in the general election held in March, 1972, to the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly from 97-Lonar constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mapari Sahebrao Bhaurao to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MT-LA/97/72(34)]

आदेश

का. आ. 2005.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए महाराष्ट्र विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 6-राजपुर निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री चावण सदानन्द शिवराम, वोरान, पोस्ट भू, तालुक राजपुर, जिला रतनगिरि (महाराष्ट्र), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री चावण सदानन्द शिवराम को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहिता घोषित करता है ।

[सं. महा.वि. स./6/72(35)]

ORDER

S.O. 2005.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Chawan Sadanand Shivram, At Torwan, Post Bhoo, Taluka Rajapur, District Ratangiri (Maharashtra), a contesting candidate in the general election held in

March, 1972, to the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly from 6-Rajpur constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Chawan Sadanand Shivram to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MT-LA/6/72(35)]

आवश

नई दिल्ली, 30 जून, 1973

का. आ. 2006.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए महाराष्ट्र विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 270-चोंवगाड निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कावेरी गनपति धोंदिया, सुलगांव, पोस्ट अजरा, तहसील अजरा, जिला कोल्हापुर, महाराष्ट्र, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व, अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार द्वारा किये गये अभ्यासदन पर विचार करने के पश्चात्, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री कावेरी गनपति धोंदिया को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आवेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरक्षित घोषित करता है ।

[सं. महा.-वि. स./270/72(37)]

वी. नागसुब्रमण्यन, सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1973

S.O. 2006.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Khavare Ganapati Dhondiba, At Sulgaon, Post Ajara, Taluka Ajara, District Kolhapur (Maharashtra), a contesting candidate in the general election held in March, 1972, to the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly from 270-Chandgad constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, after considering the representation made by the said candidate, the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Khavare Ganapati Dhondiba to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MT-LA/270/72(37)]

V. NAGASUBRAMANIAN, Secy.

आवेश

नई दिल्ली. 27 जून, 1973

का. आ. 2007.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 88-अजमेर पूर्व निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री चन्द्रमोहन, मं. नं. 357, गली नं. 4 सुन्दर विलास अजमेर, राजस्थान लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, श्री चन्द्रमोहन को भेजी गई सूचना अविवेकित वापस आ गई है क्योंकि उसका पता ठिकाना मालूम नहीं है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री चन्द्रमोहन को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आवेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरक्षित घोषित करता है ।

[सं. राज.-वि.स./88/72(4)]

बी. एन. भारद्वाज, सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 27th June, 1973

S.O. 2007.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Chander Mohan, House No. 357, Gali No. 4, Sunder Villas, Ajmer, a contesting candidate for the general election held in March, 1972, to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly from 86-Ajmer East constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses, as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the notice issued to Shri Chander Mohan has been received back undelivered as the whereabouts of the candidate are not known and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Chander Mohan to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of his order.

[No. RJ-LA/86/72(4)]

B. N. BHARDWAJ, Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व और बीमा विभाग)

केन्द्रीय उत्पादशुल्क समाहरणालय, कलकत्ता और उड़ीसा,

कलकत्ता-1

केन्द्रीय उत्पादशुल्क

कलकत्ता, 21 मई, 1973

का० प्र० 2008:—केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क नियमावली, 1944 के नियम 233 के अधीन प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए प्रबोहस्ताक्षरी एतद्द्वारा निदेश करता है कि इस समाहरणालय के दयासलाई अभिनिर्मातागण प्रबसे दयासलाई अभिनिर्माण में प्रयुक्त कच्ची सामग्रियों नामतः सीलियों और पतों, सलकर और पोटोशियम का पृथक दैनिक लेखा संलग्न प्रपत्र में रखेंगे। केन्द्रीय उत्पादशुल्क नियमावली, 1944 के नियम 55 के अधीन ऐसे अभिनिर्मातागण उपर्युक्त कच्ची सामग्रियों का प्रपत्र प्रार० टी० 5 में प्रत्येक क्वार्टर के अन्त में 10 तारीख तक सम्बद्ध केन्द्रीय उत्पादशुल्क क्षेत्राधिकारी के पास क्वार्टरली रिटर्न, भेजेंगे तथा इसकी प्रतियां कारखानों के उपर क्षेत्राधिकार वाले केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क के सहायक समाहर्ता को प्रेषित करेंगे।

दियासलाई के अभिनिर्माताओं के लिए कच्ची सामग्रियों की दैनिक लेखा

कारखाना का नाम और पता

कच्ची सामग्रियों का अभिवर्णन

तिथि	पिछला अतिशेष	इनवायस सं० और तिथि	प्रेषक का नाम	प्राप्त मात्रा	योग	अभिनिर्माण में दियासलाई	व्यवहृत मात्रा अन्य माल
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
अन्य रूप में डिसपोजल	अध्ययित या नष्ट मात्रा	अंतिम अतिशेष	अभिनिर्मित दिया- सलाईयों की मात्रा	अभिनिर्मित अन्य मालों की मात्रा	कैफियत	निर्धारक या उसके एजेंट के हस्ताक्षर	
डिसपोजल की प्रकृति	मात्रा						
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16

माह का योग

टिप्पणी -- (1) प्रत्येक कच्ची सामग्री के लिए पृथक रजिस्टर रखा जाना चाहिये।

(2) यदि कोई कच्ची सामग्री एक शुल्कवेय माल के अतिरिक्त अधिक मालों (विभिन्न टैरिफ मदों में पड़ने वाले) या अन्य अभिनिर्मित मालों के लिए प्रयुक्त हुई हो तो कालम 5 और 6 को सम्यकरूप से उप-विभाजित कर ऐसे मालों के अभिवर्णन सहित प्रत्येक ऐसे मालों के लिए प्रयुक्त मात्रा पृथकतः दिखाई जाये।

[सं० 2/कें.उ.वु./73—सी.एन.प्रो. IV (4) 86—सी.ई./72]

ए.के. बंद्योपाध्याय, समाहर्ता

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue & Insurance)

COLLECTORATE OF CENTRAL EXCISE, CALCUTTA & ORISSA, CALCUTTA

CENTRAL EXCISE

Calcutta, the 21st May, 1973

S.O. 2008.—In exercise of the powers vested under Rule 233 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, the undersigned hereby directs that the manufacturers of 'Matches' in this Collectorate, shall hereafter maintain a separate daily account of raw materials, namely, Splints and Veneers, Sulphur and potassium chlorate used in the manufacture of matches in the Form enclosed. Such manufacturers shall also furnish a Quarterly Return of the said raw materials in Form R.T. 5 under Rule 55 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944 by the 10th of the month following the Quarter to which it relates, to the Central Excise Range Officer concerned with copies to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise, having jurisdiction over the factories.

DAILY ACCOUNT OF RAW MATERIALS FOR THE MANUFACTURE OF MATCHES

Name and address of the Factory.....

Description of Raw material.....

Date	Opening Balance	Invoice No. and Date	Name of consigner	Quantity received	Total	Quantity used in the manufacture of	
						Matches	Other goods
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Quantity otherwise disposed of	Quantity wasted or destroyed	Closing Balance	Quantity of Matches manufactured	Quantity of other goods manufactured	Remarks	Signature of the Assessee or his Agent	
Nature of the disposal	Quantity						
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16

Total for the month.

NOTES: 1. Separate Registers should be maintained in respect of each raw material.

2. If any raw material is used for more than one excisable goods (falling under different tariff items) or other goods manufactured, quantity used for each of such goods should be shown separately along with description of such goods by suitably subdividing columns 5 and 6.

[No. 2/CE/73—C.No. IV (4) 86—CE/72]

A. K. BANDYOPADHYAY Collector

आय-कर

नई दिल्ली, 11 जून, 1973

का. आ. 2009.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि भारतीय अनुसंधान परिषद् नई दिल्ली, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा नीचे वर्णित संख्या के, आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (2) के प्रयोजनों के लिए अनुमोदित किया गया है।

संस्था

क्रिश्चियन मेडिकल कॉलेज एंड हॉस्पिटल, वेलोर।

[सं. 374 (फा. सं. 203/17/73-आई टी ए-2)]

टी. पी. ज़ुनज़ुनवाला, उपसचिव

INCOME TAX

New Delhi, the 11th June, 1973

S.O. 2009.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by Indian Council of Medical Research, New Delhi, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

INSTITUTION

CHRISTIAN MEDICAL COLLEGE & HOSPITAL,
VELLORE.

[No. 374 (F. No. 203/22/73-ITA. II)]

T. P. JHUNJHUNWALA, Dy. Secy.

आय-कर

नई दिल्ली, 18 जून, 1973

का. आ. 2010.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का

प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार सर्व श्री एस. पी. पाहवा, बी. के. सिंगरी, एस. एस. पुराकर्ण, चुनी लाल, सत्यन्म प्रकाश और सी. आर. श्याल के, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन कस्बसूली अधिकारियों की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. अधिसूचना सं. 194 (फा. सं. 404/35/71-आई टी सी सी) तारीख 18 जून, 1971 के अधीन श्री एस. वी. पंजवानी की और अधिसूचना सं. 253 (फा. सं. 404/35/71-आई टी सी सी) तारीख 27 अगस्त, 1971 के अधीन श्री गुरुचरण सिंह की की गई नियुक्तियों के 18 जून, 1973 से रद्द कर दिया गया है।

3. यह अधिसूचना 18 जून, 1973 को प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं. 385 (फा. सं. 404/177/73-आई टी सी सी)]

एम. एन. नाम्बियार, अवसर सचिव

INCOME TAX

New Delhi, the 18th June, 1973

S.O. 2010.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby authorises S/Shri S. P. Pabwa, B. K. Shingari, S. S. Pushkarna, Chuni Lal, Satyendra Prakash and C. R. Cyal, who are Gazetted Officer of the Central Government to exercise the powers of Tax Recovery Officers under the said Act.

2. The appointments of Shri S. V. Panjwani made under Notification No. 194 (F. No. 404/35/71-ITCC), dated 18th June, 1971 and Shri Gurcharan Singh made under Notification No. 253 (F. No. 404/35/71-ITCC), dated 27th August, 1971, are cancelled with effect from 18th June, 1973.

3. This Notification shall come into force with effect from 18th June, 1973.

[No. 385 (F. No. 404/177/73-ITCC)]

M. N. NAMBIAR, Under Secy.

(बीमा)

नई दिल्ली, 12 जूलाई 1973

का० आ० सं० 2011:—प्राप्तन जोखिम (माल) बीमा स्कीम के पैरा 22 के साथ पठित आपात जोखिम (माल) बीमा अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 50) को धारा 10 की उपधारा (5) के अनुमरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार 31 मार्च, 1972 को समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष के दौरान आपात (माल) बीमा निधि में प्राप्त और उसमें से निकाली गई रकमों का लेखा निम्नलिखित रूप में प्रकाशित करती है:—

31 मार्च, 1972 को समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष के दौरान आपात जोखिम (माल) बीमा निधि में प्राप्त और उसमें निकाली गई रकमों का लेखा:—

प्राप्तियाँ				व्यय			
रकम		मार्च 1972 के अंत तक प्राप्तियों की स्थिति		रकम		मार्च, 1972 के अंत तक व्यय की स्थिति	
रु०	पैसे	रु०	पैसे	रु०	पैसे	रु०	पैसे
1. बीमा प्रीमियम	75,00,000.00	75,00,000.00		1. सरकारी अधिकारों का पारिश्रमिक तथा व्यय और प्ररुवों का खर्च।	कुछ नहीं	कुछ नहीं	
2. धारा 10(3) के अधीन भारत की समेकित निधि से अधिम धन।	---	---		2. आपातजोखिम (माल) बीमा स्कीम के अधीन दायित्वों का संशय और स्कीम के अधीन नियुक्त हानि भत्तेसरो के पारिश्रमिक तथा व्यय।	कुछ नहीं	कुछ नहीं	

1	2	3	4	5	6
3 प्रकीर्ण	--	--	3 धारा 13 के अधीन प्रीमियम का प्रतिशत।	कुछ नहीं	कुछ नहीं
			4 धारा 10(3) के अधीन लिए गए अधिम धनो का प्रति-शत।	कुछ नहीं	कुछ नहीं
			5 प्रकीर्ण व्यय (यदि आवश्यक हो तो व्यौरे दिए जाएं)।	कुछ नहीं	कुछ नहीं
			6 धारा 10(4) के अनुसार व्ययित राशि।	कुछ नहीं	कुछ नहीं
कुल	75,00,000 00 ₹०	75,00,000 00 ₹०	कुल	कुछ नहीं	कुछ नहीं

[संख्या 69(2)-बीमा 1/72]

INSURANCE

New Delhi, the 12th July, 1973

S.O. 2011.—In pursuance of sub-section (5) of section 10 of the Emergency Risks (Goods) Insurance Act, 1971 (50 of 1971) read with paragraph 22 of the Emergency Risks (Goods) Insurance Scheme, the Central Government hereby publishes, as follows, an account of the sums received into and paid out of the Emergency Risks (Goods) Insurance Fund during the year ending with the 31st March, 1972:—

Account of the sums received into and paid out of the Emergency Risks (Goods) Insurance Fund during the year ending with the 31st March, 1972.

	Receipts				Expenditure			
	Amount		Progress of receipts upto the end of March, 1972		Amount		Progress of expenditure upto the end of March, 1972	
	Rs.	P	Rs.	P	Rs.	P	Rs.	P
1. Insurance Premium	75,00,000.00		75,00,000.00		1. Remuneration and expenses of Government Agent and cost of forms.	Nil		Nil
2. Advance from the Consolidated Fund of India under section 10(3).					2. Payment of liabilities under the Emergency Risks (Goods) Insurance Scheme and remunerations and expenses of Loss Assessors appointed under the Scheme.	Nil		Nil
3. Miscellaneous					3. Refund of premium under section 13.	Nil		Nil
					4. Repayments of advances made under section 10(3).	Nil		Nil
					5. Miscellaneous expenditure (showing details if necessary).	Nil		Nil
					6. Sums disposed of in accordance with section 10(4).	Nil		Nil
TOTAL	75,00,000.00		75,00,000.00		TOTAL	Nil		Nil

[F. No. 69(2)-Ins. 1/72-I]

का० प्रा० 2012—प्राधान्य जोखिम (उपक्रम) बीमा स्कीम के पैरा 21 के साथ पठित आपात जोखिम (उपक्रम) बीमा अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 51) की धारा 7 की उपधारा (5) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, 31 मार्च, 1972 को समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष के दौरान आपात जोखिम (उपक्रम) बीमा निधि में प्राप्त तथा उसमें से निकाली गई रकमों का लेखा निम्नलिखित रूप में प्रकाशित करती है:—

31 मार्च, 1972 को समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष के दौरान आपात जोखिम (उपक्रम) बीमा निधि में प्राप्त तथा उसमें से निकाली गई रकमों का लेखा

प्राप्तियां					व्यय			
रकम		मार्च, 1972 के अंत तक प्राप्तियों की स्थिति			रकम		मार्च, 1972 के अंत तक व्यय की स्थिति	
रु०	पैसे	रु०	पैसे		रु०	पैसे	रु०	पैसे
1	बीमा प्रीमियम	2,00,00,000.00	2,00,00,000.00	1. सरकारी अधिकारों का पारिश्रमिक तथा व्यय और प्रत्येक का खर्चा।	कुछ नहीं		कुछ नहीं	
2	धारा 7(3) के अधीन भारत की गमेकित निधि से अधिम धन।	कुछ नहीं	कुछ नहीं	2. आपात जोखिम (उपक्रम) बीमा स्कीम, के अधीन दायित्वों का सदाय और स्कीम के अधीन नियुक्त हानि असेसर्स का पारिश्रमिक तथा व्यय।	कुछ नहीं		कुछ नहीं	
3	प्रकीर्ण	कुछ नहीं	कुछ नहीं	3. धारा 10 के अधीन संवाय जहां बीमाकृत सम्पत्ति अन्य परिक्षेत्र में हटाई जानी और पुनर्निमित्त करती प्रोक्षित हो।	कुछ नहीं		कुछ नहीं	
				4. धारा 16 के अधीन प्रीमियम का प्रतिवाय।	कुछ नहीं		कुछ नहीं	
				5. धारा 7(3) के अधीन लिए गए अधिम धनो का प्रति-संवाय।	कुछ नहीं		कुछ नहीं	
				6. प्रकीर्ण व्यय (यदि आवश्यक हो तो व्योरे दिए जाएं)।	कुछ नहीं		कुछ नहीं	
				7. धारा 7(4) के अनुसार व्ययित राशि।	कुछ नहीं		कुछ नहीं	
कुल	2,00,00,000.00	2,00,00,000.00		कुल	कुछ नहीं		कुछ नहीं	

[संख्या 69(2)—बीमा 1/72]

S.O. 2012.—In pursuance of sub-section (5) of section 7 of the Emergency Risks (Undertakings) Insurance Act, 1971 (51 of 1971), read with paragraph 21 of the Emergency Risks (Undertakings) Insurance Scheme, the Central Government hereby publishes as follows, an account of the sums received into and paid out of the Emergency Risks (Undertakings) Insurance Fund during the year ending with the 31st March, 1972:—

Account of sums received into and paid out of the Emergency Risks (Undertakings) Insurance Fund during the year ending with the 31st March, 1972

Receipts				Expenditure			
Amount		Progress of receipts upto the end of March, 1972		Amount		Progress of expenditure upto the end of March, 1972	
1		2	3	4	5	6	
	Rs. P.	Rs. P.			Rs. P.	Rs. P.	
1. Insurance Premium	2,00,00,000.00	2,00,00,000.00		1. Remuneration and expenses of Government Agent and cost of forms.	Nil	Nil	
2. Advance from the consolidated Fund of India under section 7(3).	Nil	Nil		2. Payment of liabilities under the Emergency Risks (Undertakings) Insurance Scheme and remunerations and expenses of Loss Assessors appointed under the scheme.	Nil	Nil	

1	2	3	4	5	6
			remunerations and expenses of Loss Assessors appointed under the Scheme.	Nil	Nil
3. Miscellaneous	Nil	Nil	3. Payment under section 10 where the insured property is required to be removed and reconstructed in another locality.	Nil	Nil
			4. Refund of premium under Section 16.	Nil	Nil
			5. Repayment of advances made under section 7(3).	Nil	Nil
			6. Miscellaneous Expenditure (showing details if necessary)	Nil	Nil
			7. Sums disposed of in accordance with section 7(4).	Nil	Nil
TOTAL	2,00,00,000.00	2,00,00,000.00	TOTAL	Nil	Nil

[F. No. 69(2)-Ins.1/72-II]

का० आ० 2013—समुद्री जहाजों की युद्ध जोखिम बीमा स्कीम के पैरा (9) के अन्वय में, केन्द्रीय सरकार 31 मार्च, 1972 को समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष के दौरान युद्ध जोखिम (समुद्री जहाज) पुनर्बीमा निधि में प्राप्त तथा उसमें से निकाली गई रकमों का लेखा निम्नलिखित रूप में प्रकाशित करती है, अर्थात्—

31 मार्च, 1972 को समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष के दौरान युद्ध जोखिम (समुद्री जहाज) पुनर्बीमा निधि में प्राप्त तथा उसमें से निकाली गई रकमों का लेखा।

प्राप्तियाँ				व्यय			
रकम		मार्च, 1972 के अन्त तक प्राप्तियों की स्थिति		रकम		मार्च, 1972 के अन्त तक व्यय की स्थिति	
रु०	पैसे	रु०	पैसे	रु०	पैसे	रु०	पैसे
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 बीमा प्रीमियम	98,44,176 49	4,65,11,006 50	1 भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम के प्रशासनिक खर्चें।	* 19,600 00	91,717 84		
2 युद्ध जोखिम (समुद्री जहाज) पुनर्बीमा स्कीम के पैरा 8(iii) के अधीन भारत की सम्भोक्त निधि से अग्रिम धन।	कुछ नहीं	कुछ नहीं	2. युद्ध जोखिम (समुद्री जहाज) पुनर्बीमा स्कीम के पैरा 8(iii) के अधीन वायिश्वो का संदाय (यदि आवश्यक हो तो व्यौरे दिए जाएँ)।	** 22,120 00	कुछ नहीं	कुछ नहीं	
			3. पैरा 8(iii) के अधीन लिए गए अग्रिम धनो का प्रति-संदाय।	कुछ नहीं	कुछ नहीं		
			1 प्रकीर्ण व्यय (यदि आवश्यक हो तो व्यौरे दिए जाएँ)।	* 6,000	15,000.00		
				** 3,000			
			5. प्रीमियम का प्रतिदाय।	—	—		
			6 पैरा 8(iv) के अनुसार व्ययित रकम।	—	—		
कुल	98,44,176 49	4,65,11,006 50		* 50,720	1,06,717 84		

25,600 रु० का व्यय (19,600 रु० प्रशासनिक व्यय और 6,000 रु० प्रकीर्ण व्यय के रूप में) जो 1970-71 वर्ष के दौरान महालेखापाल केन्द्रीय राजस्व, नई दिल्ली के खातों में समायोजित नहीं किया गया था उस कार्यालय द्वारा 1971-72 वर्ष के लेखों में मिला लिया गया है। तारीख 8-6-72 की अधिसूचना के मन्त्र (6) में उल्लेखित होने वाला व्यय इस रकम में सम्मिलित है।

1971-72 वर्ष के लिए व्यय।

1971-72 के लिए 98,44,176.19 रु० की कुल प्राप्तियों में से 1971-72 के दौरान संपरीक्षा द्वारा 23,53,262.75 रु० की रकम समायोजित कर दी गई है और 74,90,913.74 रु० के अतिशेष को उस कार्यालय द्वारा 1972-73 के लेखों में मिला लिया जाएगा।

[पा० सं० 69(2)—बीमा 1/72]

आर० बी० गुप्त, उप-सचिव

S.O. 2013.—In pursuance of paragraph 9 of the Scheme of War Risks Insurance of (Marine Hulls), the Central Government hereby publishes, as follows, an account of the sums received into and paid out of the War Risks (Marine Hulls) Re-insurance Fund during the year ending with the 31st March, 1972, namely:—

Account of the sums received into and paid out of the 'War Risks (Marine Hulls) Re-insurance Fund' during the year ending with 31st March, 1972

Receipts			Expenditure		
	Amount	Progress of receipts upto the end of March, 1972		Amount	Progress of expenditure upto the end of March, 1972
1	2	3	4	5	6
	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
1. Insurance Premium...	98,44,176.49	4,65,11,006.50	1. Administrative expenses of the Life Insurance Corporation of India.	*19,600 **22,120	91,717.84
2. Advance from Consolidated Fund of India under paragraph 8(iii) of the War Risks (Marine Hulls) Re-insurance Scheme.	Nil	Nil	2. Payment of liabilities under paragraph 8(ii) of the War Risks (Marine Hulls) Re-insurance Scheme (showing details if necessary).	Nil	Nil
			3. Repayment of advances made under paragraph 8(iii).	Nil	Nil
			4. Miscellaneous expenditure (showing details if necessary).	6,000 **3,000	15,000.00
			5. Refund of premium
			6. Sums disposed of in accordance with paragraph 8(iv)	*50,720	1,06,717.84
TOTAL	98,44,176.49	4,65,11,006.50		*50,720	1,06,717.84

*The expenditure of Rs. 25,600/- (Rs. 19,600 as administrative Expenses and Rs. 6,000 as Miscellaneous expenditure) which was not adjusted in the books of the A.G.C.R., New Delhi, during the year 1970-71, has been incorporated in the Accounts for 1971-72 by that office. The progressive expenditure in Col (6) of notification dated the 8-6-1972 includes this Amount.

**Expenditure for 1971-72.

†Out of the total receipts of Rs. 98,44,176.49p. for 1971-72, an amount of Rs. 23,53,262.75p. has been adjusted by the Audit during 1971-72 and the balance of Rs. 74,90,913.74 will be incorporated by that office in the accounts for 1972-73.

[F. No. 69(2) Ins 1/72-III]

R. B. GUPTA, Deputy Secy.

(बैंकिंग विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 29 जून, 1973

क्रा. आ. 2014.—बैंकिंग विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) और बैंकिंग विनियमन (कम्पनीज) नियमावली, 1949 की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर, एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 31 और उपर्युक्त नियमावली का नियम 15 के उपबंध निम्नलिखित बैंकिंग कम्पनी पर, जहाँ तक उनका संबंध 31 दिसम्बर, 1972 के समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष के लिए लेखा परीक्षक की रिपोर्ट सहित तुलना-पत्र और लाभ-हानि लेखों के समाचार पत्र में प्रकाशित करने से हैं, लागू नहीं होंगे।

झारिया इण्डस्ट्रियल बैंक प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, झारिया।

[सं. 15(20)-बी. आं. 3/73]

हृषिकेश गुहा, अवर सचिव

(Department of Banking)

New Delhi, the 29th June, 1973

S.O. 2014.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) and Rule 16 of the Banking Regulation (Companies) Rules, 1949, the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions

of Section 31 of the said Act and Rule 15 of the said Rules shall not apply to the undernoted banking company in so far as they relate to the publication of its balance-sheet and profit and loss account for the year ended 31st December, 1972, together with the auditor's report in a newspaper.

Jharia Industrial Bank Private Ltd., Jharia.

[No. 15(20)-B.O. III/73]

H. K. GUHA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 जून, 1973

क्रा. आ. 2015.—बैंकिंग विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) और बैंकिंग विनियमन (कम्पनीज) नियमावली, 1949 की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर, एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 31 और उपर्युक्त नियमावली का नियम 15 के उपबंध निम्नलिखित बैंकिंग कम्पनी पर, जहाँ तक उनका संबंध 31 दिसम्बर, 1972 के समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष के लिए लेखा परीक्षक की रिपोर्ट सहित तुलना-पत्र और लाभ-हानि लेखा के समाचार पत्र में प्रकाशित करने से हैं, लागू नहीं होंगे।

यूनाइटेड मरकटाइल बैंक (आसाम) लि. गोलाघाट

[सं. 15(22)-बी. आं. 3/73]

प्रेम कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1973

S. O. 2015.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) and Rule 16 of the Banking Regulation (Companies) Rules 1949, the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of Section 31 of the said Act and Rule 15 of the said Rules shall not apply to the undernoted banking company in so far as they relate to the publication of its balance sheet and profit and loss account for the year ended 31st December, 1972, together with the auditor's report in a newspaper.

United Mercantile Bank (Assam) Ltd., Golaghat.

[No. 15(22)-B.O. III/73]

PREM KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 3 जुलाई, 1973

क्रा. आ. 2016.—बैंकिंग विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का वसवा) की धारा 56 के साथ पीठल धारा 53 के द्वारा प्राप्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करत हुए, केंद्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर, एतद्द्वारा घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 18 और 24 के उपबन्ध, इस अधिसूचना के सरकारी राजपत्र में प्रकाशित किये जाने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि तक एक सहकारी बैंक पर जहां तक उससे भारत सरकार द्वारा राष्ट्रीय सहकारी विकास निगम अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का छब्बीसवां) के अन्तर्गत स्थापित किये गये राष्ट्रीय सहकारी विकास निगम से लिये गये ऋणों या अभ्रमों के संबंध में होने वाली देनदारियों के बारे में उल्लिखित क्रमशः नकद प्रारक्षित निधि और परिसम्पत्तियों का प्रतिशत रखने की अपेक्षा करते हैं, लागू नहीं होंगे बशर्त कि धारा 18 के अन्तर्गत नकद प्रारक्षित निधि तथा परिसम्पत्तियों की संगणना करने में, जिन्हें उक्त बैंक उक्त

अधिनियम की क्रमशः धारा 24 की उपधारा (2क) के उपखण्ड (क) के अन्तर्गत सभी अन्य मांग तथा सावधिक देनदारियों के संबंध में रखता है, निगम से लिये गये ऋण के अतिरिक्त भाग और निगम से उधार ली गयी रकम के कारण निगम को न भेजी गयी वसूलियों को शामिल नहीं किया जायगा।

[सं. एफ. 8/4/72 ए. सी.]

ल. व. कटारिया, उप-सचिव

New Delhi, the 31st July, 1973

S.O. 2016.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53, read with section 56, of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of sections 18 and 24 of the said Act shall not, for a period of three years from the date of publication of this notification in the official Gazette, apply to a co-operative bank in so far as they require a co-operative bank to maintain the percentage of cash reserve and assets respectively mentioned therein in respect of liabilities arising out of loans or advances availed of by such bank from the National co-operative Development Corporation, established by Government of India under the National Co-operative Development Corporation Act, 1962 (26 of 1962):

Provided that in computing the cash reserve under section 18 and the assets which the said bank maintains under clause (a) of sub-section (2A) of section 24 respectively of the said Act, in respect of all other demand and time liabilities, the undisbursed portion of the loan availed of from the Corporation and the unremitted recoveries to the Corporation on account of the borrowing from the Corporation shall be excluded.

[No. F. 8/4/72-AC]

L. D. KATARIA, Dy. Secy.

रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया

क्रा० आ० 2017.—रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में जून 1973 की 29 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा

दृशू विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 1973

देयताएं	रुपये	रुपये	घ्रास्तियां	रुपये	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग से रखे हुए नोट	36,45,28 000		सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन —		
संचालन में नोट	5698,95,51,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,08,000	
जारी किये गये कुल नोट	—	5735,40,79,000	(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ		
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतिया	171,65,38,000	
			जोड़		354,18,46,000
			रुपये का सिक्का		8,38,06,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रति-		
			भूतिया		5372,84,27,000
			देशी विनिमय त्रिल और दूसरे		
			वाणिज्य-पत्र		..
कुल देयताएं		5735,40,79,000	कुल घ्रास्तियां		5735,40,79,000

29 जून 1973 को रिज़र्व बैंक आफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्य-कलाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	भ्रास्तिया	रुपये
भुक्ताना पूंजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	36,45,28,000
आरक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का	9,49,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि	209,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का	2,68,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि	45,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल :—	
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि	175,00,00,000	(क) देशी	15,22,92,000
जमा राशिया :—		(ख) विदेशी	
(क) सरकारी :—		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल	301,59,23,000
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	57,04,58,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ वकाया*	228,74,85,000
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	29,48,26,000	निवेश**	534,42,09,000
(ख) बैंक :—		ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	537,70,51,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	22,75,47,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को†	39,88,00,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	1,05,14,000	ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(iv) अन्य बैंक	3,10,36,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को††	140,54,20,000
(ग) अन्य	76,44,58,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को @	189,52,76,000
देय बिल	55,00,88,000	(iii) दूसरों को	11,32,75,000
अन्य देयताएं	521,83,46,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश :	
		(क) ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	66,41,05,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	17,97,46,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को	
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्निर्माण निगम को	34,50,00,000
		(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को डिबेंचरों में निवेश	11,24,91,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम	
		राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम	41,06,37,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण दीर्घकालीन (क्रियाएं) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश :—	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम	129,09,36,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडो/डिबेंचरों में निवेश अन्य भ्रास्तिया	90,29,84,000
	रुपये 1888,43,24,000		रुपये 1888,43,24,000

* तकदी आवाधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतिया शामिल हैं।

** राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

† राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से प्रवत ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

†† रिज़र्व बैंक आफ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 7(4)(ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को सीमादी बिलों पर अग्रिम किये गये 31,30,00,000 रुपये शामिल हैं।

@ राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रवत ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

एस जगन्नाथन गवर्नर

तारीख 4 अगस्त, 1973

[सं. फ० 1(i)/73-बी० ओ० 1]

अ० व० मोरचन्दानी, प्रवर सचिव

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

S. O. 2017.—An Account pursuant to the RESERVE BANK OF INDIA ACT, 1934, for the week ended the 29th day of June, 1973

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1973

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	36,45,28,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in Circulation	5698,95,51,000		(a) Held in India	182,53,08,000	
Total Notes issued		5735,40,79,000	(b) Held Outside India	..	
			Foreign Securities	171,65,38,000	
			Total		354,18,46,000
			Rupee Coin		8,38,06,000
			Government of India		
			Rupee Securities		5372,84,27,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper		..
Total Liabilities		5735,40,79,000	Total Assets		5735,40,79,000

Statement of Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 29th June, 1973

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid Up	5,00,00,000	Notes	36,45,28,000
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Rupee Coin	9,49,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	209,00,00,000	Small Coin	2,68,000
		Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
		(a) Internal	15,22,92,000
		(b) External	
		(c) Government Treasury Bills	301,59,23,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	45,00,00,000	Balance Held Abroad*	228,74,85,000
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	175,00,00,000	Investments**	534,42,09,000
		Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) Central Government	
		(ii) State Government@	39,88,00,000
Deposits :—		Loans and Advances to :—	
(a) Government		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	140,54,20,000
(i) Central Government	57,04,58,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks‡	189,52,76,000
(ii) State Governments	29,48,26,000	(iii) Others	11,32,75,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
(b) Banks		(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	537,70,51,000	(i) State Governments	66,41,05,000
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	22,75,47,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks	17,97,46,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	
(iv) Other Banks	1,05,14,000	(iv) Agricultural Refinance Corporation	34,50,00,000
	3,10,36,000	(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank	
		Debentures Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	11,24,91,000
		Loans and Advance to State Co-operative Banks	41,06,37,000
(c) Others	76,44,58,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
Bills Payable	55,00,88,000	(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	129,09,36,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	..
Other Liabilities	521,83,46,000	Other Assets	90,29,84,000
	Rupees		Rupees
	1888,43,24,000		1888,43,24,000

*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

**Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

†Includes Rs. 31,30,00,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17 (4) (c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

‡Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund

S. JAGANNATHAN, Governor

[No F.1(1)/73-B.O.I.]

C.W. MIRCHANDANI, Under Secy,

Dated 4-7-1973

(Department of Expenditure)

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 2nd July, 1973

S.O. 2018.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance, (Department of Expenditure) No. S.O. 2556, dated the 26th July, 1972, published at page 3574 of the Gazette of India, Part-II, Section-3, Sub-Section (ii) dated the 16th September, 1972, in line 34, for "rule 12", read "rule 13".

[No. 2(2)-E.V.(B)/71]

S. S. L. MALHOTRA, Under Secy.

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क कलेक्टर, बड़ौदा

बड़ौदा 5 मई, 1973

केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क

का० धा०. 2019-केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क नियम, 1944, के नियम 233 के अधीन निहित शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, अधोहस्ताक्षरी

निदेश देते हैं कि, इस कलेक्टर में, दियासलाई निर्माताओं, एवं तत्पश्चात्, समावर्त प्रपत्र में, दियासलाई के निर्माण में उपयोग किया गया कच्चा माल, अर्थात् स्लीन्ड्स तथा वीनर्स, सल्फर तथा पोटैशियम क्लोरेट का पृथक् दैनिक लेखा रखेंगे, ऐसे निर्माताओं, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क नियम, 1944 के नियम 55 के अधीन आर० टी० 5 प्रपत्र में उक्त कच्चे माल का त्रैमासिक प्रविवरण भी, आगामी त्रिमास की दि० 10 तक, सम्बन्धित केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क के सहायक समाहर्ता को प्रति प्रेषित करते हुए, सम्बन्धित केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क के रेंज अफसर को प्रस्तुत करेंगे।

सत्यापित,

हस्ता०

(एन० जी० पाटील)

अधीक्षक (तकनीकी) केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क

मुख्यालय, बड़ौदा।

डी० एन० लाल, समाहर्ता

दियासलाई के निर्माण के लिए कच्चे माल का दैनिक लेखा

कारखाने का नाम और पता.....

कच्चे माल का विवरण.....

दिनांक	प्रारम्भिक शेष	बीजक संख्या तथा तिथि	परेषक का नाम	प्राप्त मात्रा	योग	दिया सलाई	अन्य वस्तुएं
						के निर्माण में उपयोग में लाई गई मात्रा	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

अन्यथा निर्वातित मात्रा		निरर्थक या नष्ट मात्रा	संवरण शेष	निर्मित विद्या सलाई की मात्रा	निर्मित अन्य वस्तुओं की मात्रा	अभ्युक्ति	करदाता या उसके अधिकर्ता का हस्ताक्षर
निर्वर्तन का प्रकार	मात्रा						
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16

मास का योग :

टिप्पणी :—(1) प्रत्येक कच्चे माल के लिए पृथक् पंजियां रखी जानी होंगी।

(2) यदि कोई कच्चा माल, एक से अधिक उच्छुल्कारोप्य वस्तुएं (भिन्न प्रशुल्क पद के अन्तर्गत आने वाली) या निर्मित अन्य वस्तुएं के लिए उपयोग में लाया गया हो, ऐसी प्रत्येक वस्तुएं के लिए उपयोग में लाई गई मात्रा, ऐसी वस्तुएं का विवरण के साथ, स्तम्भ 5 तथा 6 का उपयुक्त उप-विभाजन द्वारा दर्शाई जानी होगी।

(सं० V/38(8)-1/73 एम० पी०)

CENTRAL EXCISE COLLECTORATE, BARODA

Baroda, the 5th May, 1973

CENTRAL EXCISES

S. O. 2019—In exercise of the powers vested under Rule 233 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, the undersigned directs that the manufacturers of 'Matches' in this Collectorate, shall hereafter maintain a separate daily account of raw materials, namely, Splints and Veeners, Sulphur and potassium chlorate used in the manu-

facture of matches in the Form enclosed. Such manufacturers shall also furnish a Quarterly Return of the said raw materials in form R.T. 5 under Rule 55 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944 by the 10th, following the Quarter to the Central Excise Range Officer concerned with copies to the Assistant Collectors of Central Excise, concerned.

Attested

N. G. Patil,

Suptdt. (Tech.) Central Excise, Hdqrs. Baroda.

DAILY ACCOUNT OF RAW MATERIALS FOR THE MANUFACTURE OF MATCHES

Name and address of the Factory.....

Description of Raw materials

Date	Opening Balance	Invoice No. and date	Name of consigner	Quantity received	Total	quantity used in the manufacture of Matcher	Other goods
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Quantity otherwise disposed of	Quantity wasted or destroyed	Closing Balance	Quantity of Matches manufactured	Quantity of other goods manufactured	Remarks	Signature of the assessee or his agent
Nature of the disposal	Quantity					
9	10	11	12	13	14	15

Total for the month

NOTES 1. Separate Registers should be maintained in respect of each raw material.

2. If any raw material is used for more than one excisable goods (falling under different tariff items) or other goods manufactured, quantity used for each of such goods should be shown separately along with description of such goods be suitably sub-dividing column 5 & 6.

[No. V. 38 (8)-1/73/MP]

D. N. LAL, Collector

विदेश मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 27 जून, 1973

क्र. आ. 2020.—राजनीय एवं कौंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम 1948 की धारा 2 के खण्ड (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा भारत के प्रधान कौंसलावास, ओडेसा में सहायक श्री आर. एस. जोशी को 6 अक्टूबर, 1972 से कौंसली अभिकर्ता का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[सं. टी. 4330/4/71]

प्रमोद कुमार, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 27th June, 1973

S.O. 2020.—In pursuance of clause (a) of section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act, 1948, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri R. S. Joshi, Assistant in the Consulate General of India, Odessa to perform the duties of a Consular Agent, with effect from 6th October, 1972.

[No. T. 4330/4/71]

PRAMOD KUMAR, Dy Secy.

बाणिज्य मंत्रालय

उप-सहायक निर्यातक, लाहौर तथा इस्पात का कार्यालय

आदेश

मद्रास, 21 अगस्त, 1971

विषय :—सर्वश्री रोहिणी इन्डस्ट्रीज, बंगलौर को अप्रैल, 68/ मार्च 69 अधि के लिए सामान्य मुद्रा क्षेत्र के अंतर्गत 0.5 एम.एम. और इससे पतली अविकारी इस्पात चट्टानों/स्ट्रिप्स के आयात के लिए 2500 रु. के लिए जारी किए गए आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी./एस./8547633/सी./एक्स. एक्स./38/एम./27.28/18/1562 दिनांक 31-3-71 की मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण/सीमा शुल्क निकासी कार्य संबंधी प्रीतिथियां को रद्द करना।

क्र. आ. 2021.—सर्वश्री रोहिणी इन्डस्ट्रीज, 33, 7 क्रॉस मगादी रोड, बंगलौर को 68/69 अधि के लिए अविकारी इस्पात चट्टानों/स्ट्रिप्स के आयात के लिए 2500 रु. का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी./एस./8547633/सी./एक्स. एक्स./38/एम./27-28/18/1562, दिनांक 31-3-71 स्वीकृत किया गया था। उन्होंने विषयाधीन लाइसेंस 46 G of I/73—3.

की अनुलिपि मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण/सीमा शुल्क निकासी कार्य संबंधी प्रीतिथियों के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण/सीमा शुल्क निकासी कार्य संबंधी प्रीतिथियां बिना उपयोग किए ही खो गई हैं। अपने तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र जमा किया है।

मैं इससे संतुष्ट हूँ कि आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी./एस./8547633/सी./एक्स. एक्स./38/एम./27-28/18/1562 दिनांक 31-3-71 की मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण/सीमा शुल्क निकासी कार्य संबंधी प्रीतिथियां खो गई हैं और निदेश देता हूँ कि आवेदक को उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण/सीमा शुल्क निकासी कार्य संबंधी प्रीतिथियां जारी की जानी चाहिए। लाइसेंस सं. पी./एस./8547633/सी./एक्स. एक्स./38/एम./27-28/18/1562 दिनांक 31-3-71 की मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण/सीमा शुल्क निकासी प्रीतिथियां एतद्वारा रद्द की जाती हैं।

[सं. एस. एम./एल-2/1562/68-69]

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Office of the Dy. Asstt. Iron & Steel Controller)

ORDER

Madras, the 21st August, 1971

SUB : Cancellation of Exchange Control/Customs Clearance Purposes copy of import licence No. P/S/8547633/C/XX/38/M/27-28/18/1562 dated 31-3-71 issued for the period April 68/March 69 for import of Stainless Steel Sheets/Strips 0.5 mm. and thinner valued at Rs. 2,500/- under General Currency Area issued in favour of M/s. Sri Rohini Industries, Bangalore.

S.O. 2021.—M/s. Sri Rohini Industries, 33, VII Cross, Magadi Road, Bangalore-23 was issued an import licence No. P/S/8547633/C/XX/38/M/27-28/18/1562 dated 31-3-71 for import of Stainless Steel Sheets/Strips for a value of Rs. 2,500/- for the period 68/69. They have applied for the issue of duplicate Exchange Control/Customs Clearance Purposes copy of the import licence in question on the ground that the Exchange Control/Customs Clearance Purposes copy of the above import licence has been lost without having been utilised. In support of their contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit.

I am satisfied that the original Exchange Control/Customs Clearance Purposes copy of the import licence No. P/S/8547633/C/XX/38/M/27-28/18/1562 dated 31-3-71 has been lost and direct that a duplicate Exchange Control/Customs Clearance Purposes copy of the import licence should be issued to the applicant. The original Exchange Control/Customs Clearance Purposes copy of import licence No. P/S/8547633/C/XX/38/M/27-28/18/1562 dated 31-3-71 is hereby cancelled

[SM/L.II/1562/68-69]

आवृश

मद्रास, 25 अगस्त, 1971

विषय :—सर्वश्री श्री रोहिणी इन्डस्ट्रीज, 33, 7 क्रॉस मगदी रोड, बंगलूर-23 को 0.5 एम. एम. और इससे पतली अविकारी इस्पात शीट्स/स्ट्रिप्स जिनमें ताप विरोधी क्रिस्म शामिल नहीं हैं के लिए 5000 रुपये के लिए जारी किए गए मूल रिहाई आदेश संख्या : पी./एस./आर./एम./921552/27-28, दिनांक 26-3-71 को रद्द करना।

का. आ. 2022.—सर्वश्री श्री रोहिणी इन्डस्ट्रीज, 33, 7, क्रॉस रोड, बंगलूर-23 को अप्रैल, 68/मार्च, 69 अवधि के लिए 68-69 की नीति पुस्तक में दिए गए के अनुसार अन्तिम उत्पाद अस्पताल उपकरण एनस्थेसिया ट्राली के लिए 0.5 एमएम और इससे पतली अविकारी इस्पात शीट्स/स्ट्रिप्स के आबंटन के लिए जिनमें ताप विरोधी क्रिस्म शामिल नहीं हैं, 5000 रुपये का एक रिहाई आदेश संख्या : पी./एस./आर./एम./921552/27-28, दिनांक 26-3-71 जारी किया गया था। फर्म ने विषयाधीन रिहाई आदेश की अनुलिपि प्रती के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल प्रती खो गई हैं। इस तर्क के समर्थन में उन्होंने यह बताते हुए एक शपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है कि उक्त रिहाई आदेश खनिज तथा धातु व्यापार निगम प्राधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत कराए बिना और उपयोग किए बिना ही खो गया है।

मैं इससे संतुष्ट हूँ कि मूल रिहाई आदेश खो गया है और फर्म को उसकी अनुलिपि प्रती जारी की जानी चाहिए।

मूल रिहाई आदेश एतद्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

[एस. एम./एल-2/1562/68-69]

एम. वीराराघवन, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

आयात-निर्यात

ORDER

Madras, the 25th August, 1971

SUB: Cancellation of original Release Order No. P/S/R/M/921552/27-28 dated 26-3-71 for Stainless Steel Sheets/Strips 0.5 mm. and thinner excluding Heat Resisting Type for a value of Rs. 5,000/- issued in favour of M/s. Sri Rohini Industries, 33, VII Cross, Magadi Road, Bangalore-23, Mysore State.

S.O. 2022.—M/s. Sri Rohini Industries, 33, VII Cross, Magadi Road, Bangalore-23, Mysore State were issued one Release Order bearing No. P/S/R/M/921552/27-28 dated 26-3-71 for the period April 68/March 69 for allotment of Stainless Steel Sheets/Strips 0.5 mm. and thinner excluding Heat Resisting Type for the end products Hospital Equipments-Anaesthesia Trolley as per 68-69 policy for a value of Rs. 5,000/-. The firm applied for a duplicate copy of Release Order in question on the ground that the original copy has been lost. In support of this contention they have filed an Affidavit to the effect that said Release Order copy has been lost without having been registered with the Minerals and Metals Trading Corporation authority and not utilised at all.

I am satisfied that the original Release Order has been lost and duplicate of the same be issued to the firm.

The Original Release Order is hereby cancelled.

[SM/I-II/1562/68-69]

M. VIRARAGHAVAN,
Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

वारिणउष मंत्रालय

(मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

आवृश

नई दिल्ली, 8 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2023.—महा-प्रबन्धक, पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे, गोरखपुर को मूल स्त्रोतों के मध्ये बेयरिंग के आयात के लिए 4386 रु. का एक आयात लाइसेंस संख्या जी./आर./2088513, दिनांक 27-12-71 स्वीकृत किया गया था।

लाइसेंसधारी ने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि प्रती (सीमा-शुल्क तथा मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण, दोनों प्रतियाँ) के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल लाइसेंस खो गया अथवा अस्थानस्थ हो गया है। उनके द्वारा आगे यह बताया गया है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस अप्रयुक्त रहा है और उसे किसी भी सीमाशुल्क कार्यालय में पंजीकृत नहीं कराया गया था।

उपर्युक्त तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट हैं कि मूल लाइसेंस संख्या जी./आर./2088513, दिनांक 27-12-71 खो गया/अस्थानस्थ हो गया है और उन्हें अनुलिपि लाइसेंस जारी किया जाना चाहिए। समय-समय पर यथा संशोधित आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण आदेश संख्या 17/35, दिनांक 7-12-55 की धारा 9 के अन्तर्गत प्रवृत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर मूल लाइसेंस एतद्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

अनुलिपि लाइसेंस पहले से ही जारी कर दिया गया है।

[सं. 73/जी./रेलवे/71-72/जी. एल. एस.]

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1973

S.O. 2023.—Import licence No. G/R/2088513 dated 27-12-1971 was issued in favour of General Manager, North Eastern Railway, Gorakhpur for the import of bearings for Rs. 4383 against Free Resources.

The licensee has requested for issue of Duplicate licence (both customs and Exchange Control copy) on the ground that the original licence has been lost or misplaced by them. It has been further reported by them that the licence in question remained unutilised and was not registered at any Customs House.

In support of the contention the applicant has filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original licence No. G/R/2088513 dated 27-12-1971 has been lost/misplaced and directs that a duplicate licence should be issued to them. In exercise of the powers conferred on the undersigned under clause 9 of the Import Trade Control order No. 17/55 dated 7-12-1955, as amended from time to time, the original licence is hereby cancelled.

Duplicate licence has already been issued.

[No. 73. G/Rly/71-72/GLS/93]

आवृश

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2024.—सर्वश्री वास्क इंडिया लि., बम्बई को मूल स्त्रोतों के मध्ये वास्क मॉनोनेटिक फिल्म के आयात के लिए 14,746 रु. का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं. जी./अ./2109298 दिनांक 25-10-72 स्वीकृत किया गया था।

लाइसेंसधारी ने लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमा-शुल्क कार्यसंबंधी तथा मुद्रा-विनिमय नियंत्रण दोनों प्रतियों के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल लाइसेंस (दोनों प्रतियाँ) उनके द्वारा खो गया अथवा अस्थानस्थ हो गया है। उनके द्वारा आगे यह प्रतीतिवृत्त किया गया

हैं कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस अप्रयुक्त रहा है और उसे किसी भी सीमा-शुल्क कार्यालय में पंजीकृत नहीं करवाया गया था।

उपयुक्त तर्कों के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि मूल लाइसेंस सं. जी/ओ/2109298 दिनांक 25-10-72 खो गया अथवा अस्थानस्थ हो गया है और निवेश देता है कि उन्हें अनुलिपि लाइसेंस जारी किया जाना चाहिए। समय-समय पर, यथा संशोधित आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण आदेश, 17/55 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर अधोहस्ताक्षरी मूल लाइसेंस को एतद्वारा रद्द करता है।

पार्टी को अनुलिपि लाइसेंस (सीमा-शुल्क तथा मूद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण, दोनों प्रतियाँ) जारी कर दिया गया है।

[24-बी./कॉन्ट/72-73/जी. एल. एस. 96]

एन. सी. कान्जीलाल, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

ORDER

New Delhi, the 11th July, 1973

S.O. 2024.—Import licence No. G/O/2109298 dated 25-10-1972 for Rs. 14,746/- for the import of Basf Magnetic film was issued in favour of M/s. Basf India Ltd., Bombay against Free Resources.

The licensee has requested for issue of duplicate copies for both Customs and Exchange Purposes on the ground that the original licence (both copies) has been lost or misplaced by them. It has been further reported by them that the licence in question remained unutilised and was not registered at any Customs House.

In support of the contention the applicant has filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original licence No. G/O/2109298 dated 25-10-1972 has been lost/misplaced and directs that a duplicate licence should be issued to them. In exercise of the powers conferred on the undersigned under clause 9 of the Import Trade Control order No. 17/55 dated 7-12-1955, as amended from time to time, the original licence is hereby cancelled.

The duplicate licence (both Customs & Exchange Control Purposes copies) has already been issued to the party.

[No. 24. B/Cont/72-73/GLS/96]

N. C. KANJILAL, Dy. Chief Controller

आवेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 जून, 1973

का. आ. 2025.—सर्वश्री सरसन इन्डस्ट्रीस प्रा. लि. पिम्परी पी. एफ., पी. ओ. पुना-18 को यू. के. से 5,000 रुपये मूल्य के फालतू पुर्जों के आयात के लिए एक आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी./डी./2177025/आर./के. एन./37/एच./31-32/एम. एल. 1/रिफ्रेक्टरी 4-1-71 प्रदान किया गया था उन्होंने लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क निकासी प्रति की अनुलिपि जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल सीमा शुल्क निकासी प्रति खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। लाइसेंस-धारी द्वारा यह भी सूचना दी गई है कि लाइसेंस का किसी भी सीमा तक उपयोग नहीं किया गया था। लाइसेंस किसी भी सीमा-शुल्क कार्यालय में पंजीकृत नहीं कराया था।

2. अपने तर्कों के समर्थन में आवेदकों ने शपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि लाइसेंस सं. पी./डी./2177025 दिनांक 4-1-71 की मूल सीमा-शुल्क निकासी प्रति खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है और निवेश देता है कि उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क प्रति की अनुलिपि उन को जारी की जानी चाहिए। मूल सीमा-शुल्क निकासी प्रति रद्द की जाती है।

सीमा-शुल्क निकासी प्रति की अनुलिपि अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[सं. रेफ./जे./2/70-71/आर. एम. 2]

ए. के. सरकार, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक
कृते मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात।

ORDFR

New Delhi, the 23rd June, 1973

S.O. 2025.—M/s. Serson Industries Pvt. Ltd., Pimpri P.F., P.O., Poona-1 were granted import licence No. P/D/2177025/KN/37/H/31-32/MLI/Refractory dated 4-1-71 from U.K. for import of Spare Parts valued at Rs. 5,000/-. They have requested for the issue of duplicate Customs Purposes Copy of the licence on the ground that the original Customs Purposes Copy of licence has been lost/misplaced. It has been further reported by the licensee that the licence was not utilized to any extent. The licence was not registered with any Custom Office.

2. In support of their contention, the applicant have filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Customs Purposes Copy of the licence No. P/D/2177025 dt. 4-1-71 has been lost/misplaced and directs that a duplicate Customs Purposes Copy of the said licence should be issued to them. The original Customs Purposes Copy is cancelled.

The duplicate Customs Purposes Copy is being issued separately.

[F. No. Ref./7/2/70-71/RM. II]

A. K. SARKAR,
Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.
for Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 1973

का० आ० 2026.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में सानन्द-14 से एस० ग्राई० पी० के निकट जी० जी० एम० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतदुपाय अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आग्रह एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बगलें कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बड़ीदा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उपरोक्त मुताबिक व्यक्ति हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मांग।

अनुसूची

SCHEDULE

सामान्य-14 से एस० आई० पी० के निकट जी० जी० एस० तक पाइपलाइन।

PIPELINE FROM SANAND-14 TO GGS NEAR SIP.

STATE: GUJARAT DIST : MEHSANA TALUKA : KADI/
KALOL

राज्य गुजरात	जिला : मेहसाणा	तालुका : काडी	कलोल
गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	ए० आर० ई० पी० ए० आर० ई०
थोल	1423	0	7 93
हाजीपुर	615 1/बी	0	6 59
	615/1ए	0	16 59
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00 85
	खण्ड संख्या		
भीमासा-एन	17	0	22 57
	15	0	1 22
	18	0	7 44
	22	0	3 42
	23	0	14 64
	26	0	5 73
	29	0	6 71
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00 50
	31	0	13 55
	32	0	4 51
	44	0	17 21
	48	0	10 86
	46	0	1 95

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Arc	P. Arc
THOL	1423	0	7	93
HAJIPUR	615/1/B	0	6	59
	615/1A	0	16	59
	Cart Track Block No.	0	00	85
BHIMASA-N	17	0	22	57
	15	0	1	22
	18	0	7	44
	22	0	3	42
	23	0	14	64
	26	0	5	73
	29	0	6	71
	Cart track	0	00	50
	31	0	13	55
	32	0	4	51
	44	0	17	21
	48	0	10	86
	46	0	1	95

[No. 11/4/72-L & L]

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 1973

[संख्या 11/4/72-लेबर एण्ड लेमिज]

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS

(Department of Petroleum)

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1973

S.O. 2026.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Sanand-14 to GGS near SIP in Gujarat State, Pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission ;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such Pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of the section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Baroda-9.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

का० प्रा० 2027.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में के-67 से सी० टी० एफ० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी ज़ाहनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्पाद अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः, अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप समक्ष प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और वैश्वमाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड बरोदा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चित यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधिब्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची					1	2	3	4	5
डी० एस० के०-67 से सी० टी० एफ० तक पाइपलाइन						1202/1/1	0	6	53
राज्य गुजरात जिला : महसाना तालुका : कालोल						1202/1/2	0	1	00
गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	ए० आर० पी० ए०	ई० आर० ई०		1206	0	4	80
1	2	3	4	5		1200/1	0	1	42
सेज	98/2	0	1	35		1200/2	0	8	40
	100/1	0	7	65		1199	0	1	00
	100/2	0	5	40		1198/1	0	5	70
	100/3	0	5	40		1195/1	0	1	00
	100/4	0	5	70		1196/1	0	4	50
	101/2	0	1	00		1196/4	0	5	25
	74/6	0	3	00		1196/5	0	1	00
	74/7	0	2	85		1196/2	0	6	00
	73/1	0	8	10		1184/3	0	4	50
	73/3	0	4	80		1184/4	0	2	10
	73/4	0	5	10		1184/1	0	2	70
	1524/1	0	0	60		1188/1	0	5	55
	1524/2	0	6	37		1183/3	0	4	50
	71/2	0	5	33		वी०पी० बैरल ब्रेण्ड	0	5	72
	71/3	0	2	85		982	0	4	35
	1525/1	0	2	10		993	0	16	05
	70/3	0	5	04		984	0	2	40
	1530/1	0	12	10		976	0	10	80
	1530/2	0	3	35	[सी० 12016/1/73(iii) लेबर एण्ड लेजिस]				
	1531/1-ए	0	1	00	New Delhi, the 9th July, 1973				
	1528/1	0	8	10	S.O. 2027. —Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from K-67 to C.T.F. in Gujarat State, Pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;				
	1528/3	0	12	45	And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such Pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;				
	1435/1	0	2	30	Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;				
	1535/2	0	6	15	Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority,, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Baroda-9.				
	1535/3	0	8	00	And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.				
	1536/1	0	7	05					
वी० पी० कार्ट ट्रैक		0	1	39					
	1470/1	0	42	52					
	1441	0	4	50					
	1442	0	8	40					
	1443	0	1	95					
	1462/1	0	1	20					
	1449	0	9	00					
	1447	0	4	35					
	1448/1	0	4	35					
	1448/2	0	8	77					
वी०पी० कार्ट ट्रैक		0	1	20					
सेज	1227	0	3	07					
	1224/1	0	4	12					
	1225	0	5	40					
	1226/2	0	7	50					
	1226/3	0	3	90					
	1205/ए०	0	5	25					
	1205/बी०	0	6	60					
	1205/सी०	0	1	00					

SCHEDULE

PIPELINE FROM D.S.K —67 to C.T.F.

STATE . GUJARAT DIST . MEHSANA TAL: KALOL

Village	Survey No	Hectare	Are	P Are
Sauj	98/2	0	1	35
	100/1	0	7	65
	100/2	0	5	40
	100/3	0	5	40
	100/4	0	5	70
	101/2	0	1	00
	74/6	0	3	00
	74/7	0	2	85
	73/1	0	8	10
	73/3	0	4	80
	73/4	0	5	10
	1524/1	0	0	60
	1524/2	0	6	37
	71/2	0	5	33
	71/3	0	2	85
	1525/1	0	2	10
	70/3	0	5	04
	1530/1	0	12	10
	1530/2	0	3	35
	1531/1-A	0	1	00
	1528/1	0	8	10
	1529/3	0	12	45
	1535/1	0	2	30
	1535/2	0	6	15
	1535/3	0	8	00
	1536/1	0	7	05
	V. P. Cart track	0	1	39
	1470/1	0	42	52
	1441	0	4	50
	1442	0	8	40
	1443	0	1	95
	1462/1	0	1	20
	1449	9	9	00
	1447	0	4	35
	1448/1	0	4	35
	1448/2	0	8	77
	V. P. Catt track	0	1	20
	1227	0	3	07
	1224/1	0	4	12
	1225	0	5	40
	1226/2	0	7	50
	1226/3	0	3	90
	1205/A	0	5	25
	1205/B	0	6	60
	1205/C	0	1	00
	1202/1/1	0	6	53
	1202/1/2	0	1	00
	1206	0	4	80
	1200/1	0	1	42
	1200/2	0	8	40
	1199	0	1	00
	1198/1	0	5	70
	1195/1	0	1	00
	1196/1	0	4	50
	1196/4	0	5	25
	1196/5	0	1	00
	1196/2	0	6	00
	1184/3	0	4	50
	1184/4	0	2	10
	1184/1	0	2	70
	1188/1	0	5	55
	1183/3	0	4	50
	V. P. barren land	0	5	72
	982	0	4	35
	993	0	16	05
	984	0	2	40
	976	0	10	80

का० आ० 2028 —यह केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कलोल-17 एवं 110 से सी० टी० एफ० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसे लाइन को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः, अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उगमे उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आणख्य पतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

वशत कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप समक्ष-प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड बरोदा-9 का इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्ति हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कलोल-110 एवं कलोल-17 से सी० टी० एफ० तक पाइपलाइन।

राज्य गुजरात	जिला मेहसाना	तालुका कलोल		
गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर ए०आर०	पी०ए०	ई० आर०ई०
1	2	3	4	5
धानज	157	0	28	95
	158	0	7	06
	166	0	10	05
	167	0	15	75
	172	0	12	67
	173	0	11	67
	175	0	16	75
	176	0	1	00
	158	0	1	00
	177	0	14	40
	बी०पी० कार्ट ट्रैक	0	1	35
	156	0	6	90
	156	0	17	28
	152	0	11	62
	155	0	6	86
	151	0	18	12
	196	0	5	27
	196	0	30	88
	199	0	25	85
	200	0	8	48
	203	0	19	60
	209	0	16	18
	210	0	13	60
	211	0	1	00
	बी०पी० कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	75

1	2	3	4	5
धानज	213	0	17	60
	बो.पी. कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	96
	212	0	1	00
	39	0	38	00
	224	0	34	00
	225	0	7	22
	16	0	9	70
	14	0	60	94

[संख्या 12016/1/73 (IV) मेबर एण्ड लेजिस]

बी. आर. भल्ला, अवर सचिव ।

S.O. No. 2028. -Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Kalol-17 & 110 to C.T.F. in Gujarat State, Pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

AND WHEREAS it appears that for the purpose of laying such Pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

PROVIDED THAT any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Baroda-9.

AND every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

PIPELINE FROM KALOL — 110 & KALOL 17 TO C.T.F.
STATE: GUJARAT DIST: MEHSANA TAL: KALOL

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Ac	P	Ac
Dhanaj	157	0	28	95	
	156	0	7	06	
	166	0	10	05	
	167	0	15	75	
	172	0	12	67	
	173	0	11	67	
	175	0	16	75	
	176	0	1	00	
	158	0	1	00	
	177	0	14	40	
	V. P. Cart track	0	1	35	
	156	0	6	90	
	156	0	17	28	
	152	0	11	62	
	153	0	6	86	
	154	0	18	12	
	196	0	5	27	
	196	0	30	88	
	199	0	25	85	
	200	0	8	48	
	203	0	19	60	
	209	0	16	48	
	210	0	13	60	
	211	0	1	00	
	V. P. Cart track	0	00	75	
	213	0	17	60	
	V. P. Cart track	0	00	96	
	212	0	1	00	
	39	0	38	00	
	224	0	34	00	
	225	0	7	22	
	16	0	9	70	
	14	0	60	94	

[No. 12016/1/73(IV)/L&L]

B. R. BHALLA, Under Secy.

औद्योगिक विकास मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2029.—उद्योग (विकास तथा विनियमन) अधिनियम 1951 (1951 का 65) की धारा 6 के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एवं विकास परिषद् (कार्यविधि) नियम, 1962 के नियम 2, 4, और 5 के साथ पढ़ते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व औद्योगिक विकास तथा आंतरिक व्यापार मंत्रालय (औद्योगिक विकास विभाग) के आदेश सं. का. आ. पी./डी. सी./आर्. डी./71 दिनांक 23/30 मार्च, 1971 जिसे समय-समय पर संशोधित किया गया, के अधीन नियुक्त किए गए सदस्यों के स्थान पर जिनका कार्यकाल समाप्त हो गया है, 15 जुलाई, 1973 से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए कागज, लुगदी तथा सहबद्ध उद्योगों के निर्माण अथवा उत्पादनरत अनुसूचित उद्योगों की विकास परिषद् का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है:—

कागज लुगदी और सहबद्ध उद्योगों की विकास परिषद्

- श्री एम. एल. जूतशी, अध्यक्ष
मै. बल्लारपुर पेंपर एण्ड बोर्ड मिल्स,
थापर हाउस,
124, जनपथ, नई दिल्ली ।
- श्री बी. डी. सांगानी, सदस्य
पश्चिम कोस्ट पेंपर मिल्स,
श्रीनिवास हाउस,
वांदली रोड, बंबई ।
- डा. जे. सी. अग्रवाल, सदस्य
पूनालूर पेंपर मिल्स,
पूनालूर, कर्नाट ।
- डा. आर. एल. भार्गव, वही
अध्यक्ष,
हिन्दुस्तान पेंपर कारपोरेशन,
डी-44, एन. डी. एस. ई. पार्ट 2,
नई दिल्ली-49 ।
- श्री एच. एस. सिंघानिया, वही
मै. स्टार् प्राइवेट लि.
नेहरू हाउस,
4-बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग,
नई दिल्ली-1 ।
- डा. एस. आर. डी. गूहा, वही
प्रभारी अधिकारी पेंपर आंच,
फारेस्ट रिसर्च इन्स्टीट्यूट, कोल्लूज,
बंहराबून, पो. आ.न्यू फारेस्ट ।
- श्री आर. एम. मेहता, वही
शिवेणी तिससूज,
3, मिडलटन स्ट्रीट,
कलकत्ता-16 ।
- श्री वी. पी. गोयल, वही
मै. हरिहर पोलीफाइबरस, इण्डस्ट्रीज हाउस,
जे. पी. ओ. बाक्स नं. 5124,
45-फैयरफील्ड हाउस, बंगलौर ।

9. डा. के. के. तलवार, सव्य
मैं. पेपर प्राइवेट्स,
घासवानी मैसन्स,
120, दीनशाहावा रोड,
बंबई ।
10. श्री के. विश्वनाथन, वही
मैं. रोलिस्ट्रॉक कं. लि.,
6, जवाहरलाल नेहरू रोड,
कलकत्ता-13 ।
11. श्री शंकर घोष, वही
टीटागढ़ पेपर मिल्स,
घाटई बैंक बिल्डिंग,
कलकत्ता-1 ।
12. सभापति, फंडेशन आफ पेपर ट्रेडर्स एसोसिएशन । वही
13. श्री के. एल. राजघडिया, वही
मैं. राजेन्द्र पेपर मिल्स,
701, आकाश दीप,
बाराखम्भा रोड, नई दिल्ली-1 ।
14. श्री एन. नारायणन, वही
प्रबंध निदेशक,
सैलोलोजिक्स कन्सल्टेन्ट (इण्डिया) प्रा. लि.,
सी-48-एन. डी. एस्. ई.-2, नई दिल्ली ।
15. डा. एस. के. केशव, वही
मैं. इण्डियन टोबाको कं. लि.,
वजीरिया हॉम, 37, चौराही,
कलकत्ता-16 ।
16. चीफ कन्ट्रोलर ऑफ प्रिंटिंग एण्ड स्टेशनरी, नई दिल्ली । वही
17. श्री एन. रवीन्द्रनाथन, वही
मैं. शंकाषयी पेपर एण्ड बोर्ड मिल्स लि.,
ई. आर. ओ. डी. ई., तमिलनाडु ।
18. डा. क. डी. मारीवाला, वही
नेशनल इण्डस्ट्रियल डेव. कारपोरेशन,
चाणक्य भवन, विनय मार्ग,
नई दिल्ली-21 ।
19. श्री एस. पी. कश्यप, वही
मैं. उत्कल मशीनरी लि.,
कंसबहल, जिला-सुन्दरगढ़,
उड़ीसा ।
20. श्री आई. जे. चॉल्स, वही
बेट्टेम्स एण्ड स्कॉट, (इण्डिया) लि.,
1/1, किम्बर स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता ।
21. डा. बी. एन. बिहानी, वही
टैक्नोलॉजिस्ट,
बंगाल पेपर मिल्स लि.,
रानीगंज, पश्चिम बंगाल ।
22. प्री इन्वेस्टमेंट सर्विस् आफ फारेस्ट रिसोर्सिज (नामित किया का एक प्रतिनिधि ।
23. सी.एस.आई.आर. का एक प्रतिनिधि । सव्य
24. दो संसद सव्य (नामित किया जाना है)
25. (लोक सभा व राज्य सभा)

26. डॉ. श्रीमक प्रतिनिधि वही
- 27.
28. श्री आर. जे. शास्त्री, सदस्य
मैं. जैसप्स एण्ड कं. लि.,
63, नेताजी सुभाष रोड,
कलकत्ता-1 ।
29. श्री ए. डी. अधिकारी, वही
अशांक पेपर मिल्स,
8-सैल स्ट्रीट,
कलकत्ता-16
30. श्री ए. एन. राव, सव्य सचिव
विकास अधिकारी,
तकनीकी विकास का महानिदेशालय,
नई दिल्ली ।

तकनीकी विकास के महानिदेशालय में विकास अधिकारी श्री ए. एन. राव को उक्त पत्रिष्ठ का सचिव नियुक्त किया जाता है

[फा. सं. 3(45)/73-पेपर सेल]

एन. एस. चौधरी, उप-सचिव

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

ORDER

New Delhi, the 9th July, 1973

S.O. 2029.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951), read with Rules 2, 4 and 5 of the Development Councils (Procedural) Rules, 1962, the Central Government hereby appoints, for a period of two years with effect from the 15th July, 1973, the following persons to be members of the Development Council for the scheduled industries engaged in the manufacture or production of Paper, Pulp and Allied Industries, in place of members appointed under the Government of India in the late Ministry of Industrial Development and Internal Trade (Deptt. of Industrial Development) Order No. S.O.P./DC/ID/71 dated the 23rd/30th March, 1971, as amended from time to time, whose tenure of office has expired:

DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL FOR PAPER, PULP AND ALLIED INDUSTRIES

Chairman

1. Shri M. I. Zutshi, M/s. Ballapur Paper & Board Mills, Thapar House, 124, Janpath, New Delhi.

Members

2. Shri B. D. Somani, West Coast Paper Mills, Sree-nivas House, Waudby Road, Bombay.
3. Dr. J. C. Aggarwal, Punalur, Paper Mills, Punalur, Kerala.
4. Dr. R. L. Bhargava, Chairman, Hindustan Paper Corporation, D-44, South Extension, Part-II, New Delhi-49.
5. Shri H. S. Singhanian, M/s. Straw Products Ltd., Nehru House, 4, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi.
6. Dr. S. R. D. Guha, Head of Cellulose Branch, Forest Research Institute, Dehradun.
7. Shri R. M. Mehta, Tribeni Tissues, 3, Middleton Street, Calcutta-16.

8. Shri V. P. Gohel, M/s. Harihar Polyfiners, Industries House, JPO Box No. 5124, 45, Fair field House, Bangalore.
9. Dr. K. K. Talwar, M/s. Paper Products, Vaswani Mansions, 120, Dinshahwacha Road, Bombay.
10. Shri K. Vishwanathan, M/s. Rollspring Co. Ltd., 6, Jawaharlal Nehru Road, Calcutta-13.
11. Shri Shankar Ghosh, Titaghar Paper Mills, Chartered Bank Building, Calcutta-1.
12. President, Federation of Paper Traders Association.
13. Shri K. L. Rajgharia, M/s. Rajendra Paper Mills, 701, Akash Deep, Barakhamba Road, New Delhi-1
14. Shri N. Narasimhan, Managing Director, Cellulosics Consultants (India) Pvt. Ltd., C-48, NDSE-II, New Delhi.
15. Dr. S. K. Keshav, M/s. Indian Tobacco Co. Ltd., Virginia House, 37, Chowringhee, Calcutta-16.
16. Chief Controller of Printing and Stationery, New Delhi.
17. Shri N. Ravindranathan, M/s. Seshasayee Paper and Board Mills Ltd., ERODE, Tamilnadu.
18. Dr. Kan. D. Mariwalla, National Industrial Dev. Corporation, Chanakya Bhawan, Vinay Marg, New Delhi-21.
19. Shri S. P. Kashyap, M/s. Utkal Machinery Ltd., Kansbahal, Distt. Sundargarh, Orissa.
20. Shri I. J. Chouls, Betrams & Scott., (India) Ltd., 1/1, Kimber Street, Calcutta.

21. Dr. B. N. Bihani, Technologist, Bengal Paper Mills Ltd., Ranigunge, West Bengal.

(To be nominated)

22. A Representative of Pre-investment Survey of Forest Resources.

Member

23. A nominee of C.S.I.R.

(To be nominated)

24. To Members of Parliament

25. (Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha).

26. Two labour representatives.

27. Members.

28. Shri R. J. Shahaney, M/s. Jessops and Co. Ltd., 63, Netaji Subhash Road, Calcutta-1.

29. Shri A. D. Adhikari, Ashok Paper Mills, 8, Russel Street, Calcutta-16.

Member Secretary

30. Shri A. N. Rao, Development Officer, D.G.T.D., New Delhi.

Shri A. N. Rao, Development Officer, Directorate General of Technical Development, New Delhi, is hereby appointed to carry on the functions of Secretary of the said Development Council.

[No. 3(45)/73-PAPER CELL]

N. S. CHOUDHARY, Dy. Secretary

औद्योगिक विकास, विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्रालय

भारतीय मानक संस्था

नई दिल्ली, 29 जून, 1973

का० घ्रा० 2030 —समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन विज्ञान) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 14 के उप-विनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि नीचे अनुसूची में जिन लाइसेंसों के व्यतिरे दिए गए हैं, वे लाइसेंसधारियों का कार्य असन्तोषजनक होने के कारण 4 जून, 1973 से रद्द कर दिए गए हैं :—

अनुसूची

लाइसेंस सं० और तिथि	लाइसेंसधारियों का नाम और पता	लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु/प्रक्रिया	तत्सम्बन्धी भारतीय मानक
सी० एम०/एल-2098 30-9-1969	मेसर्स नेशनल पेस्टीसाइड्स, 5-इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, बिदिशा (म०प्र०)।	डी० डी० टी० पायसनीय तेज द्रव	I S : 633-1956
सी० एम०/एल०-2138 31-10-1969	मेसर्स नेशनल पेस्टीसाइड्स, 5-इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, बिदिशा (म०प्र०)।	बी० एच० सी० धूलन पाउडर	I S : 561-1962
सी० एम०/एल०-2156 28-11-1969	मेसर्स नेशनल पेस्टीसाइड्स, 5-इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, बिदिशा (म०प्र०)।	एल्ट्रिन धूलन पाउडर	I S : 1308-1958
सी० एम०/एल०-2345 16-6-1970	मेसर्स नेशनल पेस्टीसाइड्स, 5-इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, बिदिशा (म०प्र०)।	मालाथियोन धूलन पाउडर	I S : 2568-1963

[सं० एम० डी० डी०/55:2156]

डी० दास गुप्ता, निदेशक (सेंट्रल मार्क्स)

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION

New Delhi, the 29th June, 1973

S. O. 2030—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations, 1955, as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby notifies that the licences, particulars of which are given below have been cancelled with effect from 4 June, 1973 as the performance of the licensee was unsatisfactory :—

SCHEDULE

Licence No. and Date	Name and Address of the Licensee	Article/Process Covered by the licence	Relevant Indian Standard
CM/L2098 30-9-1969	M/s National Pesticides, 5 Industrial Estate, Vidisha (MP).	DDT Emulsifiable Concentrates	IS : 633-1956
CM/L-2138 31-10-1969	M/s National Pesticides, 5 Industrial Estate, Vidisha (MP).	BHC Dusting Powders	IS : 561-1962
CM/L-2156 28-11-1969	M/s National Pesticides, 5 Industrial Estate, Vidisha (MP).	Aldrin Dusting Powders	IS : 1308-1958
CM/L-2345 16-6-1970	M/s National Pesticides, 5 Industrial Estate, Vidisha (MP).	Malathion Dusting Powders	IS : 2568-1963

[No MDD/55:2156]

D. Das Gupta
Director (Central Marks), ISI.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार नियोजन मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 30 जून, 1973

का. आ. 2031.—भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद् अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 11 की उप-धारा (2) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद् से परामर्श करने के बाद एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की प्रथम अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है। नामतः —

उक्त अनुसूची में,

(1) गोहाटी विश्वविद्यालय से संबंधित प्रविष्टियों में “डॉक्टर आफ मेडीसिन, (जीव रसायन) - - - एम. डी. (जीव रसायन), गोहाटी” की प्रविष्टि के बाद निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएँ।

“मास्टर आफ सर्जरी
(कर्ण नासा कण्ठ विज्ञान) एम.एस. (कर्ण, नासा, कण्ठ विज्ञान), गोहाटी
कर्ण-नासा-कण्ठ विज्ञान में डिप्लोमा डी.एस.ओ., गोहाटी।

डॉक्टर आफ मेडीसिन
(सामान्य आयुर्विज्ञान) एम.डी. (सा.आ.), गोहाटी

डॉक्टर आफ मेडीसिन
(प्रसूति और स्त्रीरोग विज्ञान) एम.डी. (प्रसूति और स्त्रीरोग विज्ञान), गोहाटी

(2) नागपुर विश्वविद्यालय से संबंधित प्रविष्टियों में “मास्टर आफ सर्जरी (शरीर रचना विज्ञान) एम. एस. (शरीर रचना विज्ञान), नागपुर” की प्रविष्टि के बाद निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएँ।

“संवेचनाहरण विज्ञान में डिप्लोमा डी.एस., नागपुर
“शिशु स्वास्थ्य में डिप्लोमा डी.सी.एस., नागपुर

(3) बड़ौदा एम. एस. विश्वविद्यालय से संबंधित प्रविष्टियों में “मास्टर आफ सर्जरी (कर्ण-नासा-कण्ठ विज्ञान) - - - एम. एस. (कर्ण-नासा-कण्ठ विज्ञान), बड़ौदा की प्रविष्टि के बाद निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाए :-

“मास्टर आफ सर्जरी

(शरीर रचना विज्ञान) एम.एस. (शरीर रचना विज्ञान),
बड़ौदा

शिशु स्वास्थ्य में डिप्लोमा डी. सी. एस., बड़ौदा

(4) श्री वेंकटेश्वर विश्वविद्यालय से संबंधित प्रविष्टियों में “मास्टर आफ सर्जरी (सामान्य शल्य चिकित्सा) - - - एम. एस. (सा. शल्य चिकित्सा), वेंकटेश्वर” की प्रविष्टि के बाद निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाए :-

“क्लीनिकल पैथोलोजी में डिप्लोमा - - - डी. सी. पी. वेंकटेश्वर

(5) “बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय” से संबंधित प्रविष्टियों में “डॉक्टर आफ मेडीसिन (शरीर क्रिया विज्ञान) - - - एम. डी. (श. क्रि. विज्ञान), बनारस” की प्रविष्टि के बाद निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएँ :-

“मास्टर आफ सर्जरी (प्रसूति एवं एम. एस. (प्रसूति और स्त्री स्त्री रोग विज्ञान) रोग वि.), बनारस

डॉक्टर आफ मेडीसिन

(प्रसूति और स्त्री रोग विज्ञान)

एम.डी. (प्रसूति एवं स्त्री रोग विज्ञान), बनारस”

[सं. बी. 11015/12/73-एम. पी. टी.]

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 30th June, 1973

S.O. 2031.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 11 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government, after consulting the Medical Council of India, hereby makes the following amendments in the First Schedule to the said Act, namely:—

In the said Schedule—

(i) in the entries relating to the University of Gauhati, after the entry “Doctor of Medicine (Biochemistry)... M.D. (Biochem.), Gauhati, the following entries shall be inserted, namely:—

“Master of Surgery (Oto-rhino-laryngology)—M.S. (Oto-rhino-laryngology), Gauhati,

Diploma in Oto-Rhino—Laryngology—D.L.O. Gauhati,
Doctor of Medicine (General Medicine)—M.D. (Gen. Med.), Gauhati,

Doctor of Medicine (Obstetrics and Gynaecology)—
M.D. (Obst. & Gynae.), Gauhati”.

(ii) in the entries relating to the University of Nagpur, after the entry “Master of Surgery (Anatomy)... M.S. (Ana.), Nagpur”, the following entries shall be inserted, namely:—

“Diploma in Anaesthesiology—D.A., Nagpur

Diploma in Child Health—D.C.H., Nagpur”

(iii) in the entries relating to the M.S. University of Baroda, after the entry “Master of Surgery (Oto-rhino-Laryngology)... M.S. (Oto-rhino-laryngology), Baroda”, the following entry shall be inserted, namely:—

“Master of Surgery (Anatomy)—M.S. (Ana.), Baroda
Diploma in Child Health—D.C.H., Baroda”

(iv) in the entries relating to the Shri Venkateswara University, after the entry “Master of Surgery (General Surgery)—M.S. (Genl. Surg.), Venkateswara”, the following entry shall be inserted, namely:—

“Diploma in Clinical Pathology—D.C.P., Venkateswara”

(v) in the entries relating to the “Banaras Hindu University”, after the entry “Doctor of Medicine (Physiology)—M.D. (Phy.), Banaras”, the following entries shall be inserted, namely:—

“Master of Surgery (Obstetrics and Gynaecology)—
M.S. (Obst. & Gynae.), Banaras,

Doctor of Medicine (Obstetrics and Gynaecology)—
M.D. (Obst. & Gynae.), Banaras”.

[No. V. 11015/12/73-MPT]

आवृत्ति

नई दिल्ली, 10 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2032.—यतः भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व स्वास्थ्य मंत्रालय की दिनांक 14 जून, 1965 की अधिसूचना सं. 18-1/64 एम. पी. टी. द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने निर्देश दिया है कि भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद् अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) के प्रयोजनों के लिए अलबर्ट विश्वविद्यालय, कनाडा द्वारा प्रदत्त “एम. डी.” मान्य चिकित्सा अर्हता होगी, और यतः डा. आर्मण्ड जेम्स अष्टीग्रोव

का जिसके पास उक्त अर्हता है धर्मार्थ कार्य के प्रयोजनों के लिए फिलहाल मिशन अस्पताल, चिंचपाड़ा के साथ सम्बद्ध है।

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम, की धारा 14 की उपधारा (1) के परन्तुक के भाग (ग) का पालन करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा—

(1) 6 फरवरी, 1973 से अगले दो वर्षों की अवधि

अथवा

(2) उस अवधि को जब तक डा. आर्मण्ड जेम्स आष्टीग्रोव मिशन अस्पताल, चिंचपाड़ा के साथ सम्बद्ध रहते हैं, जो भी कम हो वह अवधि विनिर्दिष्ट करती है, जिसमें पूर्वाक्त डा. मेडिकल प्रैक्टिस कर सकेंगे।

[फा. सं. बी. 11016/15/73 एम. पी. टी.]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th July, 1973

S.O. 2032.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Health No. 18-1/64-MPT, dated the 14th June, 1965, the Central Government has directed that the Medical qualification, "M.D." granted by the University of Alberta, Canada, shall be a recognised Medical Qualification for the purposes of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956);

And Whereas Dr. Ormond James Uptigrove, who possesses the said qualification, is for the time being attached to the Mission Hospital, Chinchpada for the purposes of charitable work;

Now, Therefore, in pursuance of clause (c) of the proviso to sub-section (1) of section 14 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby specifies:—

- (i) a further period of two years with effect from the 6th February, 1973, or
- (ii) the period during which Dr. Ormond James Uptigrove is attached to the said Mission Hospital, Chinchpada, whichever is shorter, as the period to which the medical practice by the aforesaid doctor shall be limited.

[No. V. 11016/15/73-MPT]

फा. आ. 2033.—यतः भारतीय दन्त चिकित्सा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 16) की धारा 3 के खण्ड (ग) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में डा. के. रामचन्द्र, एम. बी.बी. एस., एम. डी. प्राध्यापक आयुर्विज्ञान तथा मुख्य चिकित्सक, मद्रास मेडिकल कालेज, मद्रास-3 को मद्रास विश्वविद्यालय द्वारा 28 अप्रैल, 1973 से भारतीय दन्त चिकित्सा परिषद् का सदस्य निर्वाचित किया गया है,

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व स्वास्थ्य मंत्रालय की

दिनांक 17 अक्टूबर, 1962 की अधिसूचना संख्या 3-2/62 एम.11, में आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, नामतः:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में "धारा 3 के खण्ड (ग) के अधीन निर्वाचित" शीर्षक के अंतर्गत क्रम संख्या 5 के सामने की प्रविष्टि के लिये निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जाएगी, नामतः—

"डा. के. रामचन्द्र, एम. बी. बी. एस., एम. डी. आयुर्विज्ञान के प्राध्यापक तथा मुख्य चिकित्सक मद्रास मेडिकल कालेज, मद्रास-3,"

[सं. बी. 12013/1/72 एम. पी. टी.]

क. सती बालकृष्णा, अवर सचिव

S.O. 2033.—Whereas in pursuance of the provisions of clause (d) of section 3 of the Dentists Act, 1948 (16 of 1948), Dr. K. Ramachandra, M.B.B.S., M.D., Professor of Medicine and Chief Physician, Madras Medical College, Madras-3, has been elected by the University of Madras to be a member of the Dental Council of India with effect from the 28th April, 1973;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Health No. 3-2/62-M II, dated the 17th October, 1962, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading "Elected under clause (d) of section 3", for the entry against serial No. 5, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"Dr. K. Ramachandra, MBBS, MD, Professor of Medicine and Chief Physician Madras Medical College, Madras-3".

[No.V.12013/1/72-MPT]

KM. SATHI BALAKRISHNA, Under Secy.

पूति विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 5 जुलाई, 1973

क्रो० आ० 2034.—नियम 9 के उपनियम (2), नियम 12 के उपनियम (2) के खण्ड (ख) तथा केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवाएं (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण तथा प्रभोग) नियमावली 1965 के नियम 34 के साथ पठित नियम 24 के उप नियम 1, के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए राष्ट्रपति एतद्वारा, यह निदेश देते हैं कि भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व औद्योगिक तथा पूति मंत्रालय (पूति तथा तकनीकी विकास विभाग) की समय-समय पर, यथा संशोधित अधिसूचना संख्या एस० आर० प्रो० 3687 दिनांक 12 अक्टूबर, 1964 में और आगे संशोधन किया जाए:—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में "भाग 1, सामान्य केन्द्रीय सेवा, श्रेणी-3 में वेतन और लेखा संगठन, पूति मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली/कलकत्ता/

बम्बई/मद्रास" शीर्षक के लिए तथा उसके अन्तर्गत की गई प्रविष्टियों के लिए निम्नलिखित शब्द प्रस्थापित किए जायेंगे, अर्थात् :—

पद का नाम	नियुक्ति अधिकारी	वण्ड देने के लिए सक्षम अधिकारी तथा वण्ड जो यह दे सकता है (नियम 11 की मद संख्याओं के संदर्भ में)		अपील प्राधिकारी
		प्राधिकारी	दण्ड	
1	2	3	4	5
"मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का संगठन				
(1) मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली जिसमें निम्नलिखित सम्मिलित हैं :—				
(क) पूर्ति स्कन्ध, नई दिल्ली ।				
(ख) खाद्य तथा कृषि स्कन्ध, नई दिल्ली ।				
(ग) पुनर्वास स्कन्ध, नई दिल्ली ।				
(घ) पुनर्वास स्कन्ध, माना कैम्प ।				
एस० ए० एस० लेखाकार/अधीक्षक	मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	सभी	सचिव, पूर्ति विभाग ।
अन्य सभी पद	उप मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी प्रशासन तथा समन्वय ।	उप मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी (प्रशासन तथा समन्वय) ।	सभी	मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।
(2) वरिष्ठ उप मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का कार्यालय, कलकत्ता जिसमें निम्नलिखित सम्मिलित हैं :—				
(क) पूर्ति स्कन्ध, कलकत्ता ।				
(ख) खाद्य तथा कृषि स्कन्ध कलकत्ता ।				
एस० ए० एस० लेखाकार/अधीक्षक	मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	सभी	सचिव, पूर्ति विभाग ।
अन्य सभी पद	उप मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	उप मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	सभी	मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।
(3) उप मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का कार्यालय, बम्बई जिसमें निम्नलिखित सम्मिलित हैं :—				
(क) पूर्ति स्कन्ध, बम्बई ।				
(ख) खाद्य और कृषि स्कन्ध, बम्बई ।				
(ग) पुनर्वास स्कन्ध, बम्बई ।				
एस० ए० एस० लेखाकार/अधीक्षक	मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	सभी	सचिव, पूर्ति विभाग मुख्य-बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।
अन्य सभी पद	उप मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	उप मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	सभी	मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।
(4) उप मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का कार्यालय, मद्रास जिसमें निम्नलिखित सम्मिलित हैं :—				
(क) पूर्ति स्कन्ध, मद्रास ।				
(ख) खाद्य और कृषि स्कन्ध, मद्रास ।				
एस० ए० एस० लेखाकार/अधीक्षक	मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	सभी	सचिव, पूर्ति विभाग ।
अन्य सभी पद	उप मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	उप मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।	सभी	मुख्य बेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।"

2. "भाग 2-सामान्य केन्द्रीय सेवा, श्रेणी-4" शीर्षक के लिए "घतन तथा लेखा संगठन, पूर्ति मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली/कलकत्ता/बम्बई/मद्रास" तथा उसके अन्तर्गत की गई प्रविष्टियों के लिए निम्नलिखित शब्द को प्रतिस्थापित किए जायेगा, अर्थात् :—

दइ देने के लिए सक्षम प्राधिकारी तथा वण्ड जो यह वे सकता है				
पदनाम	नियुक्ति अधिकारी	(नियम 11 की सब संख्याओं के संदर्भ में)	प्राधिकारी	अपील प्राधिकारी
1	2	3	4	5
"मुख्य वेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का संगठन.				
(1) मुख्य वेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली जिसमें निम्नलिखित सम्मिलित है :—				
(क) पूर्ति स्कन्ध, नई दिल्ली ।				
(ख) खाद्य तथा कृषि स्कन्ध, नई दिल्ली ।				
(ग) पुनर्वास स्कन्ध, नई दिल्ली ।				
(घ) पुनर्वास स्कन्ध, माना कैम्प ।				
सभी पद	कार्यालय अध्यक्ष	कार्यालय अध्यक्ष	सभी	मुख्य वेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।
(2) वरिष्ठ उप मुख्य वेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का कलकत्ता जिसमें ये कार्यालय सम्मिलित हैं :—				
(क) पूर्ति स्कन्ध, कलकत्ता ।				
(ख) खाद्य तथा कृषि स्कन्ध, कलकत्ता ।				
सभी पद	कार्यालय अध्यक्ष	कार्यालय अध्यक्ष	सभी	मुख्य वेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।
(3) उप मुख्य वेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का कार्यालय, बम्बई, जिसमें ये कार्यालय सम्मिलित हैं :—				
(क) पूर्ति स्कन्ध, बम्बई ।				
(ख) खाद्य तथा कृषि स्कन्ध, बम्बई ।				
(ग) पुनर्वास स्कन्ध, बम्बई ।				
सभी पद	कार्यालय अध्यक्ष	कार्यालय अध्यक्ष	सभी	मुख्य वेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।
(4) उप मुख्य वेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का कार्यालय मद्रास जिसमें ये कार्यालय सम्मिलित हैं :—				
(क) पूर्ति स्कन्ध, मद्रास ।				
(ख) खाद्य तथा कृषि स्कन्ध, मद्रास				
सभी पद	कार्यालय अध्यक्ष	कार्यालय अध्यक्ष	सभी	मुख्य वेतन और लेखा अधिकारी ।"

DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY

New Delhi, the 5th July, 1973

[फाइल संख्या 17/1/67-बी०]
एस० एस० पुरी, सयुक्त सचिव
Technical Development) No. S.R.O. 3687, dated the 12th
October, 1964, as amended from time to time namely :—

S.O. 2034.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 9, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 12, and sub-rule (1) rule 24 read with rule 34 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965, the President hereby directs that the following further amendments shall be made in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Industry and Supply (Department of Supply and

In the Schedule to the said notification, in "Part I, General Central Service, Class III" for the heading "Pay and Accounts Organisation, Ministry of Supply, New Delhi/Calcutta/Bombay/Madras" and the entries thereunder ; the following shall be substituted, namely :—

SCHEDULE

Designation of Post	Appointing Authority	Authority competent to impose penalties, and penalties which it may impose (with reference to item numbers in rule 11) Authority Penalties.	Appellate Authority
1	2	3	4
"Chief Pay and Accounts Officer's Organisation			
(i) Office of the Chief Pay and Accounts Officer, New Delhi comprising of :			
(a) Supply Wing, New Delhi.			
(b) Food and Agriculture Wing, New Delhi.			
(c) Rehabilitation Wing, New Delhi.			
(d) Rehabilitation Wing, Mana Camp.			
S.A.S. Accountant(Superintendent	Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	All Secretary, Department of Supply.

1	2	3	4	5
All other posts.	Deputy Chief Pay and Accounts Officer (Administration & Co-ordination).	Deputy Chief Pay & Accounts Officer (Administration & Coordination).	All	Chief Pay & Accounts Officer.
(ii) Office of the Senior Deputy Chief Pay and Accounts Officer, Calcutta, comprising of :				
(a) Supply Wing, Calcutta.				
(b) Food and Agriculture Wing, Calcutta.				
S.A.S. Accountant/Superintendent.	Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	All	Secretary, Department of Supply.
All other posts.	Deputy Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	Deputy Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	All	Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.
(iii) Office of the Deputy Chief Pay and Accounts Officer, Bombay comprising of :				
(a) Supply Wing, Bombay.				
(b) Food and Agriculture Wing, Bombay.				
(c) Rehabilitation Wing, Bombay.				
S.A.S. Accountant/Superintendent.	Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	All	Secretary Department of Supply.
All other posts.	Deputy Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	Deputy Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	All	Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.
(iv) Office of the Deputy Chief Pay and Accounts Officer, Madras, comprising of :				
(a) Supply Wing, Madras				
(b) Food and Agriculture Wing, Madras.				
S.A.S. Accountant/Superintendent.	Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	All	Secretary, Department of Supply.
All other posts.	Deputy Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	Deputy Chief Pay and Accounts Officer.	All	Chief Pay and Accounts Officer."

2. In "part II--General Central Service, Class IV" for the heading "Pay and Accounts Organisation, Ministry of Supply, New Delhi/Calcutta/Bombay/Madras" and the entries thereunder, the following shall be substituted, namely :—

Designation of Post	Appointing Authority	Authority competent to impose penalties, and penalties which it may impose (with reference to item numbers in rule 11)	Appellate Authority	
		Authority	Penalties	
1	2	3	4	5
"Chief Pay and Accounts Officer's Organisation.				
(i) Office of the Chief Pay and Accounts Officer, New Delhi comprising of :				
(a) Supply Wing, New Delhi.				
(b) Food and Agriculture Wing, New Delhi.				
(c) Rehabilitation Wing, New Delhi.				
(d) Rehabilitation Wing, Mana Camp.				
All posts	Head of Office	Head of Office	All	Chief Pay & Accounts Officer.
(ii) Office of the Senior Deputy Chief Pay and Accounts Officer, Calcutta comprising of :				
(a) Supply Wing, Calcutta.				
(b) Food and Agriculture Wing, Calcutta.				
All posts	Head of Office	Head of Office	All	Chief Pay & Accounts Officer.

1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Office of the Deputy Chief Pay and Accounts Officer, Bombay, comprising of :				
(a) Supply Wing, Bombay.				
(b) Food and Agriculture Wing, Bombay.				
(c) Rehabilitation Wing, Bombay.				
All posts	Head of Office	Head of Office	All	Chief Pay & Accounts Officer.
(iv) Office of the Deputy Chief Pay and Accounts Officer, Madras, comprising of :				
(a) Supply Wing, Madras.				
(b) Food and Agriculture Wing, Madras.				
All posts	Head of Office	Head of Office	All	Chief Pay & Accounts Officer."

[File No. 17/1/67-V]

S. S. PURI, Joint Secy.

कृषि मंत्रालय
(खाद्य-विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 5 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2035.—राष्ट्रपति, केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियम, 1965 के नियम 9 के उपनियम (2), नियम 12 के उपनियम (2) के खण्ड (ख) और नियम 24 के उपनियम (1) के अनुसरण में, भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व खाद्य, कृषि, सामुदायिक विकास और सहकारिता मंत्रालय (खाद्य विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 835, तारीख 12 जनवरी, 1971 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करते हैं, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में,—

- (1) भाग-1 साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा, वर्ग 3 में "मुख्य वेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली" शीर्षक और उसके अंतर्गत स्तंभ 1 से 5 तक की प्रविष्टियों का और "वेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का कार्यालय, मुम्बई/कलकत्ता/मद्रास" शीर्षक और उसके अंतर्गत स्तंभ 1 से 5 तक की प्रविष्टियों का लोप किया जाएगा,
- (2) भाग 2—साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा, वर्ग-4 में, "मुख्य वेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली," शीर्षक और उसके अंतर्गत स्तंभ 1 से 5 तक की प्रविष्टियों का और "वेतन और लेखा अधिकारी का कार्यालय, मुम्बई/कलकत्ता/मद्रास" शीर्षक और उसके अंतर्गत स्तंभ 1 से 5 तक की प्रविष्टियों का लोप किया जाएगा।

[सं. सी. 11012/2/72-ए. पी. यू.]

जगदीश राय जैन, अवर सचिव

**MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT & CO-OPERATION**
(Department of Food)

New Delhi, the 5th July, 1973

S.O. 2035.—In pursuance of sub-rule (2) of rule 9, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 12 and sub-rule (1) of rule 24 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal)

Rules, 1965, the President hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Department of Food) No. S.O. 635 dated the 12th January, 1971 namely :—

In the Schedule to the said notification,

- (i) In part I—General Central Service, Class III, the headings "Office of the Chief Pay and Accounts Officer, New Delhi" and the entries thereunder in columns 1 to 5 and "Office of the Pay and Accounts Officer, Bombay/Calcutta/Madras" and entries thereunder in columns 1 to 5 shall be omitted;
- (ii) In Part II—General Central Service, Class IV, the headings "Office of the Chief Pay and Accounts Officer, New Delhi" and the entries thereunder in columns 1 to 5, and "Office of the Pay and Accounts Officer, Bombay/Calcutta/Madras" and entries thereunder in columns 1 to 5 shall be omitted.

[No. C. 11012/2/72-AVU]

J. R. JAIN, Under Secy.

नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय

(परिवहन पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2036.—नौवहन विकास निधि समिति (साधारण) नियम, 1960 के नियम 3 के साथ पीठल व्यापार नौवहन अधिनियम, 1958 (1958 का 44) की धारा 15 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार विधि, न्याय तथा कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय के अधिवक्ता (सालीसटर) श्री पी. कं. बोस को 3 अप्रैल, 1973 से नौवहन विकास निधि समिति का सदस्य पुनः नियुक्त करती है और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व परिवहन तथा संचार मंत्रालय (परिवहन विभाग) (परिवहन पक्ष) की अधिसूचना सं. 33-एम. एस. (222)/58-11 दिनांक 17 मार्च, 1959 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :

उक्त अधिसूचना में क्रम सं. 5 तथा तत् सम्बन्धी प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किया जाय, अर्थात् :—

“5 श्री पी. के. बॉस,

सालीसटर, भारत सरकार,
विधि, न्याय तथा कम्पनी कार्य
मंत्रालय

3-4-1973”

[सं. 35-एम. डी. (34)/73]

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT

(Transport Wing)

New Delhi, the 7th July, 1973

S.O. 2036.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 15 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958) read with rule 3 of the Shipping Development Fund Committee (General) Rules, 1960, the Central Government hereby reappoints Shri P. K. Bose, Solicitor to the Government of India, Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, as a member of the Shipping Development Fund Committee with effect from 3rd April, 1973 and makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Transport and Communications (Department of Transport) (Transport Wing), No. 33-MS(222)/58-II, dated the 17th March, 1959, namely :—

In the said notification, for Serial No. 5 and the entries relating thereto, the following shall be substituted, namely :—

“5. Shri P. K. Bose, Solicitor to the Government of India, Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs.
3-4-1973”.

[No. 35-MD(34)/73]

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2037.—राष्ट्रीय नौवहन बोर्ड, नियम 1960 के नियम 4 के उपनियम (2) के साथ पठित व्यापार पोत अधिनियम, 1958 (1958 का 44) की धारा 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार श्री बी. बी. लाल के स्थान पर वाणिज्य मंत्रालय के सचिव श्री वाई. टी. शाह को राष्ट्रीय नौवहन बोर्ड का सदस्य नियुक्त करती हैं और भारत सरकार के नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय (परिवहन पक्ष) की अधिसूचना सं. सा. आ. 600 दिनांक 24 जनवरी, 1972 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती हैं, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में क्र. सं. 7 के सामने की प्रविष्टि में “श्री बी. बी. लाल” के स्थान पर “श्री वाई. टी. शाह” शब्द और अक्षर प्रतिस्थापित किए जाए।

[सं. 37-एम. डी. (6)/73]

[इन्द्रजीत, अवर सचिव]

New Delhi, the 11th July, 1973

S.O. 2037.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958), read with sub-rule (2) of rule 4 of the National Shipping Board Rules, 1960, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Y. T. Shah, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, as a member of the National Shipping Board, in place of Shri B. B. Lal and makes the following further amendment to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) No. S.O. 600, dated the 24th January 1972, namely :—

In the said notification, in the entry against Serial No. 7, for the words and letters “Shri B. B. Lal”, the words and letters “Shri Y. T. Shah” shall be substituted.

[No. 37-MD(6)/73.

I. J. MURGAI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2038.—मोटर गाड़ी अधिनियम, 1939 (1939 का 4) की धारा 42 की उपधारा (3) के खण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केंद्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय (परिवहन पक्ष) की अधिसूचना सं. 39-सी. ए. जी. (12)/70-111 दिनांक 15 मई, 1973 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती हैं, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, मव दो के बाद निम्नलिखित मद जोड़ी जाय, अर्थात् :—

“3. निजी वाहन, जिसकी मालिक केंद्रीय सरकार अथवा राज्य सरकार उपक्रम हो तथा जिसका प्रयोग अपने व्यापार कार्य की उन्नति के लिए वेश के विभिन्न स्थानों पर उसके द्वारा तैयार किये गए माल के प्रदर्शन के लिए प्रदर्शनों के रूप में किया जा रहा हो”।

[सं. 39-सी. ए. जी. (40)/73]

New Delhi, the 9th July, 1973

S.O. 2038.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (1) of sub-section (3) of section 42 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939 (4 of 1939), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) No. 39-TAG(12)/70-111, dated the 15th May, 1973, namely :—

In the said notification, after item 2, the following item shall be added, namely :—

“3. A private carrier owned by a Central Government or State Government Undertaking and being used as an exhibition van for demonstrating the goods manufactured by it at different places of the country for promotion of its business activities”.

[No. 39-TAG(40)/73.]

नई दिल्ली, 10 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2039.—मोटर गाड़ी अधिनियम, 1939 (1939 का 4) की धारा 63 ए की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केंद्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री एम. एस. भण्डारी, संयुक्त निदेशक, यातायात दर, रेलवे बोर्ड, को श्री बी. सी. राज-गोपाल के स्थान पर अंतराज्य परिवहन आयोग में सदस्य नियुक्त करती हैं और भारत सरकार के नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय (परिवहन पक्ष) की अधिसूचना सं. 23-सी (2) 67, दिनांक 9 अगस्त, 1972 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती हैं, अर्थात् उक्त अधिसूचना में मद (2) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित मद प्रतिस्थापित की जाय, अर्थात् :—

“श्री एम. एस. भण्डारी, संयुक्त निदेशक, यातायात दर,
रेल मंत्रालय,

(रेलवे बोर्ड)

सदस्य।”

[सं. 23-सी. (7)/73.]

ए. ए. अनन्तानारायणन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 10th July, 1973

S.O. 2039.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 63 A of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939 (4 of 1939), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri M. S. Bhandari, Joint Director, Traffic Rates, Railway Board, as a Member of the Inter-State Transport Commission in place of Shri V. C. Rajagopal, and makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government

of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) No. 23-T (11)/67, dated the 9th August, 1972, namely :—

In the said notification, for item (2), the following item shall be substituted, namely :—

"Shri M. S. Bhandari, Joint Director, Traffic Rates, Ministry of Railways, (Railway Board)...member".

[No. 23-T(7)/73.]

N. A. A. NARAYANAN, Under Secy.

संचार विभाग

(डाक-तार बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2040.—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय तार नियम 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड 3 के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक ने मुंगेर टेलीफोन केंद्र में दिनांक 16-8-73 से प्रकाशित वर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[सं. 28/73-पी. एच. बी.]

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

(P & T Board)

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1973

S.O. 2040.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 16-8-73 as the date on which the Measured Rate system will be introduced in Monghyr Telephone Exchange, Bihar Circle.

[No. 5-28/73-PHB.]

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2041.—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय तार नियम 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड 3 के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक ने बहूला टेलीफोन केंद्र में दिनांक 1-9-73 से प्रमाणित वर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[संख्या 5-13/73-पी. एच. बी.]

ए. एस. वोहरा, सहायक महानिदेशक, (पी. एच. बी.)

New Delhi, the 7th July, 1973

S.O. 2041.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 1-9-73 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Bahula Telephone Exchange, West Bengal Circle.

[No. 5-13/73-PHB.]

A. S. VOHRA, Assistant Director General (PHB).

सिंचाई और विद्युत् मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 8 मई, 1973

का. आ. 2042.—भारतीय बिजली अधिनियम, 1910 की धारा 36 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा सिंचाई और विद्युत् मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या ई. एल. ए-6(11)/65, दिनांक 31 जुलाई, 1971 और 29 मार्च 1972 के अनुक्रम 46 G of I/73—5.

में केंद्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा निदेशक (वाणिज्यिक) केंद्रीय जल और विद्युत् आयोग (विद्युत् स्कंध) नई दिल्ली को वित्त मंत्रालय द्वारा स्थापित किए जाने वाले अलकाल्वाइड परियोजना, नीमच (मध्य प्रदेश) के लिए केंद्रीय बिजली निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. बिजली दो 4(1)/73]

एम. रामनाथन, उप-निदेशक

MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER

New Delhi, the 8th May, 1973

S.O. 2042.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of section 36 of the Indian Electricity Act, 1910, and in continuation of Ministry of Irrigation and Power Notifications No. EL. II-6(11)/65, dated 31st July, 1971 and 29th March, 1972, the Central Government hereby appoints the Director (Commercial), C.W. & P.C. (Power Wing), New Delhi to be Central Electrical Inspector for Alkaloid Project, Neemuch (Madhya Pradesh) being set up by the Ministry of Finance.

[No. EL. II-4(1)/73.]

M. RAMANATHAN, Dy. Director (Power).

श्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय

(श्रम और रोजगार विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 4 जून, 1973

का. आ. 2043.—यतः केंद्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में गोल्डन सिनिडिह कोलियरी, डाकघर लुण्डू, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धसत्र से संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है,

और यतः केंद्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्दिष्ट करना वांछनीय समझती है,

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उत्तधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केंद्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केंद्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण संख्या 2, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्दिष्ट करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या गोल्डन सिनिडिह कोलियरी डाकघर लुण्डू, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धसत्र की श्री अर्जुन ठाकुर, पम्प खलासी का 26 जुलाई, 1972 से कार्य बन्द करने की कारवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार हैं?"

[सं. एल-2012/163/73-एल. आर. 2]

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 4th June, 1973

ORDER

S.O. 2043.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employees in relation to the management of Golden Sinidih Colliery, Post Office Tundoo, District Dhanbad and their

workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

AND, WHEREAS, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Golden Sindih Colliery, Post Office Tundoo, District Dhanbad, in stopping the work of Sri Arjun Thakur, Pump Khalasi with effect from the 26th July, 1972 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

[No. L-2012/163/72-LRII.]

S.O. 2044.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the National and Grindlays Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 28th June, 1973.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 62 of 1972

Parties :

Employees in relation to the National and Grindlays Bank Limited, Calcutta,

AND

Their Workmen.

Present :

Sri S. N. Bagchi, Presiding Officer.

Appearance :

On behalf of Employers.—Sri M. S. Bala with Sri K. C. Roy.

On behalf of Workmen.—Sri A. D. Singh, General Secretary, National & Grindlays Bank Staff Union.

State : West Bengal.

Industry : Banking.

AWARD

By Order No. L. 12012/131/72/LRIII, dated 25th October, 1972 the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, referred the following dispute existing between the employers in relation to the National and Grindlays Bank Ltd., Calcutta and their workmen, to this tribunal, for adjudication, namely :

"Having regard to the nature of duties performed by Sri Panch Kari Ganguly, a subordinate staff of the Church Lane Branch, Calcutta, whether the employers in relation to M/s. National and Grindlays Bank Ltd., Calcutta are justified in refusing clerical grade to him (Sri Ganguly) ? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled and from what date?"

2. On 27th December, 1972, the General Secretary, National and Grindlays Bank Staff Union purported to file a statement of case, not for the workman, but for the General Secretary, National & Grindlays Bank Staff Union since the

statement of case was signed by the petitioner Sri A. D. Singh, General Secretary and was verified by Sri A. D. Singh, General Secretary of the union.

3. The management filed its statement of case signed and verified by the Manager, National & Grindlays Bank Ltd., Church Lane, Calcutta on 10-1-1973. In paragraph 3 of the statement it is stated by the management that the present order of reference has been made at the instance of Sri Panch Kauri Ganguly. The management understands that Sri Panch Kauri Ganguly is not a member of the above staff Union but that he is a member of National and Grindlays Bank Employees' Union, which is the recognised union and that the said union is not espousing his cause. In paragraph 4 of the statement it is stated that the management is employing 1710 workmen in its branches in Calcutta. The management submits that Sri Panch Kauri Ganguly's case was and is not supported by the Union of the Workmen of this Bank nor by an appreciable/substantial number of workmen of this Bank. In paragraph 5, it is stated that the management understands that the National and Grindlays Bank Staff Union, which is unrecognised, has no members at all and the Union is put to strict proof of proving the number of its members, if any. In paragraph 6, it is stated that in view of the above, the dispute between Sri Panch Kauri Ganguly and the Bank is not an industrial dispute within the meaning of Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act. It is, therefore, submitted that the matter referred to this Hon'ble Tribunal is not an industrial dispute. Hence the present order of reference is incompetent in law and no valid adjudication can be made thereon. Referring to the issue referred to for adjudication, the management submits in Paragraph II that the objection raised in paragraph I is one which concerns the jurisdiction of this Tribunal to adjudicate on the reference and the same should, therefore, be tried as a preliminary issue and a preliminary award is to be given thereof. The management in the penultimate paragraph of its statement of case craved leave of the tribunal to file additional written statement on merits if necessary. On 5-5-73 the management filed an additional written statement on merits of the case which is not necessary now at this stage to narrate elaborately. On 16th May, 1973 the management filed a further written statement. In paragraph 4, it is stated that the terms of employment of the Bank workmen are settled by awards, settlements and the latest Bipartite Settlement. In paragraph 5, it is stated that in the order of reference it is mentioned that the management is refusing to give Sri Ganguly clerical grade. In paragraph 7 it is stated that the question of giving clerical grade to a member of the subordinate staff would only arise if he has been entrusted with clerical duties by the management or if the management asked him to do clerical work. In paragraph 8, it is stated that the management submits that it never entrusted Sri Ganguly with nor asked him to do any clerical work.

4. A rejoinder was filed to the management's written statement dated 15th May, 1973, filed on 16th May, 1973, signed by Sri A. D. Singh, General Secretary, National and Grindlays Bank Staff Union, Calcutta and verified by one Sri A. D. Singh who describes himself as petitioner. The cause title of the rejoinder reads as "The humble petitioner most respectfully sheweth". The management's initial written statement, additional written statement and further written statement were filed being signed and verified by the Manager, National & Grindlays Bank Ltd., Church Lane, Calcutta. The General Secretary of the union first filed a statement signed and verified by him. Then the General Secretary of the union filed rejoinder signed and verified by him. In the first statement and in the rejoinder the General Secretary describes himself in the cause title as the petitioner. The General Secretary of the union was authorised by the workman Panch Kauri Ganguly involved in the dispute to file written statement and to represent him in this proceeding. So, we have to look into Rule 29 of the Central Rules and Rules 10B(1) thereof which read as follows :

"Rule 10B(1): Where the Central Government refers any industrial dispute for adjudication to a Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal, within two weeks of the date of receipt of the order of reference, the party representing workmen and the employer involved in the dispute shall file with the Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal, as the case may be, a statement of the demands relating only to the issues as are included in the order of reference and shall also forward a copy

of such statement to each one of the opposite parties involved in the said dispute :

Rule 29: Right of representatives.—The representatives of the parties appearing before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal or an arbitrator shall have the right of examination cross-examination and of addressing the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal or arbitrator when an evidence has been called.”
(Underlined by me for emphasis).

Under Rule 10B(1) the party representing the workmen usually means either an office bearer or a member of the executive of a registered trade union of which the workman involved in the dispute is a member. So, the party representing the workmen is only to file the statement of case made and signed by the workmen party to the dispute. The party representing the workmen or as a matter of that party representing the management or the employer, cannot, therefore, sign and/or verify a statement of case. The party representing the workmen and the party representing the employer, under 10B(1) of the Central Rules shall only file the statement of case. Under Rule 29 of the Central Rules, the representative of a party to the dispute must be one, duly appointed by a party to the dispute under relevant sub-section and clauses of Section 36, read with Rule 36 Form F of the Central Rules. If a workman who is a party to the dispute desires to be represented in any proceeding under the Industrial Disputes Act, he is required to make and subscribe a letter of authority as prescribed by Rule 36 Form F of the Central Rules appointing any office bearer of a registered trade union of which he is a member or any member of the executive of such registered trade union, as under Section 36(1)(a) of the I. D. Act, to represent the workman in all the proceeding under the I. D. Act. That representative of the workmen, so duly appointed by the workmen can then act under Rule 29 in three ways. He can examine and cross-examine a witness and address the adjudicatory authority when evidence has been called for. So, the representative of a party can act in four ways before the tribunal, (a) by filing the statement of case as under Rule 10B(1) and (b) by examining a witness, (c) by cross-examining a witness and (d) by addressing the tribunal when evidence is called for as under Rule 29. The Central rules do not authorise a representative of a party to act in any manner otherwise than what is provided for by the rules themselves. Rule 37 of the Central Rules reads as follows : “A party appearing by a representative shall be bound by the acts of that representative”. So, the words “a party appearing by a representative” as in rule 37 of the Central Rules must be read with the relevant sub-section and clauses of Sec. 36 of the I. D. Act and Rule 36 and form F of the Central Rules depending on the character of representation in a particular case. The rules are part of the law (Delhi Cloth & General Mill's case—1972 II LLJ, 99 Sc.). If a representative of a party is not duly appointed to represent the party to the dispute in any proceeding under the I.D. Act, the act of the representative appearing for the party shall not bind the party concerned. The statement of case that was purported to be filed by the petitioner A. D. Singh, General Secretary of the Staff union was signed and verified by him but was not signed and verified by the workman concerned. The rejoinder to the management's written statement of case, as already mentioned, was signed and verified by Sri A. D. Singh, General Secretary and was filed by him but was neither signed nor verified by the workman concerned. So, anything contained in the two written statements, signed and verified by the petitioner A. D. Singh, purported to be for the workman concerned in the dispute, being on the very face of such statements of Sri A. D. Singh himself, does not relate to an act done by a lawful representative in a lawful manner to bind the workman, in view of Rules 37 of the Central Rules read with Rule 29 and Rule 10B(1) thereof.

5. So far I have discussed how the union claiming to represent the workman involved in this proceeding purported to file statement of case seemingly to be for workman involved in this dispute and also the rejoinder to the management's additional written statement. On 16-5-1973, the management filed an additional written statement pin pointing the issue as to the constitution of the reference, its legality and entertainability and adjuability by this tribunal as being not an industrial dispute under Sec. 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act. On that day Sri Singh for the union wanted time to file rejoinder to the management's

additional written statement. On 25-5-73 a rejoinder purporting to be from the workman, as I have already discussed, was filed by Sri Singh against the management's additional written statement. On 23-5-73 after hearing the management's representative and the workman's representative Sri A. D. Singh, 28-5-73 was fixed for hearing the preliminary issues. The management was represented by Mr. M. S. Bala and the workman was represented by Sri A. D. Singh, General Secretary of the Union. Documents relating to the question as to whether the dispute is an industrial dispute filed by both the sides were received in evidence. The preliminary issues, relating to whether the dispute referred to for adjudication is an industrial dispute and can be entertained and adjudicated upon as such by this tribunal were argued on the management's side by Mr. M. S. Bala. He formulated his points of argument on the following lines :

- (i) (a) The union i.e. the National and Grindlays Bank Staff Union which claims to represent the individual workman involved in this dispute is a union of minority of the workmen of the employer bank and the union does not represent substantial number of workmen of the employer employed in the industry i.e. the bank.
- (b) The union representing the workman has no representative character; and cannot, by espousing the cause of an individual workman, convert an individual dispute into a collective i.e. industrial dispute.
- (c) The members of the union who are workmen of the employer are in microscopic minority compared with the workmen who are members of the other majority union of workmen.
- (ii) The reference, as in the schedule constituted, relates to promotion of a sub-staff of the bank to the clerical grade and as such does not constitute an industrial dispute within Sec. 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act.
- (iii) No charter of demand for promotion of the individual workman, a sub-staff in the bank, to the clerical grade was served either by the individual workman or by the union representing the workman before the management, and as such the reference as constituted is not an industrial dispute.

6. The reference as constituted reads as follows :

“Having regard to the nature of duties performed by Sri Panch Kari Ganguly, a subordinate staff of the Church Lane Branch, Calcutta, whether the employers in relation to M/s. National and Grindlays Bank Ltd., Calcutta are justified in refusing clerical grade to him (Sri Ganguly)? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled and from what date?”

Mr. Bala while arguing the points referred to above first relied on Ext. M5 being the branch wise list of award staff (clerical and subordinate) as on 31-12-72. In Calcutta branches of the Bank, the number of clerical and subordinate staff on 31-12-1972 were 1710. He next drew my attention to Ext. M9, a letter from National and Grindlays Bank Employees' Union dated 11th January, 1973 addressed to the Regional Manager, Eastern Region, National and Grindlays Bank Ltd., 19, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta. In paragraph 1 of the letter it is stated that the workman involved in this dispute Panch Kari Ganguly, a subordinate staff of Church Lane Branch is a member of the union and his membership folio number is 784. In paragraph 2 of the letter it is stated “In terms of the decision of the Annual General Body meeting of our Union, Sri Panchkari Ganguly executed a mandate authorising the Manager of your Church Lane Branch to pay subscription to the Union to the debit of salary every year, the original of which is with the said office. Sri Ganguly is still a member of our Union”. Ext. M6 is an authority signed by the workman involved in this dispute Panchkari Ganguly addressed to the Manager, National and Grindlays Bank Ltd., Church Lane dated 7-7-1972. By this letter he authorised the Manager and requested him to deduct from the salary for the month of July 1972 the amount of his annual subscription to National and Grindlays Bank Employees' Union, Calcutta for the year 1972. In the second paragraph, it is stated, “I also do hereby authorise you to deduct from my salary for the Month of January each year commencing from 1973 such amount as will be duly advised by the above named Union towards payment

of my annual subscription each year from 1973 onwards". The last line of the letter is this authority will remain in force unless otherwise withdrawn by me in writing". The workman Panchkari Ganguly who deposed in this case admitted Ext. M6 as had been signed by him. He said in cross-examination, "I am a member of the National and Grindlays Bank Employees' Union from the beginning and even now". He further stated in cross-examination, "I am a member of two registered unions such as National and Grindlays Bank Employees' Union and National and Grindlays Bank Staff Union. I am member of the National and Grindlays Bank Staff Union from April 1971. I am still a member of that union". So, the individual workman is member of both the registered trade unions of workmen, employed in the bank i.e. the National and Grindlays Bank Ltd., Church Lane. In paragraph 3 of Ext. M 9 referred to above it is stated as follows: "We have not raised any dispute regarding the promotion of Shri Panchkari Ganguly as explained in the foregoing". In paragraph 4 of the letter, Ext. M 9 it is stated that the total number of membership of the union named National and Grindlays Bank Employees' Union is 1689 as on 31st December, 1972. The Reference is dated 25th October, 1972. On 31st December, 1972, the National and Grindlays Bank Employees' Union had 1698 workmen members. Then Mr. Bala relied on the Register of members produced by Sri Singh, General Secretary of National and Grindlays Bank Staff Union which was called for by the management and marked Ext. M 4. In this register Sl. 69 reads as follows: "69 Shri Rudra Pratap Singh..... 1971 Sub. R. No. 3.50—274—1972—" After Sl. 69 there is no entry in the register. So it may be presumed that upto the end of 1972 there were 69 members of the union. The membership register begins from 1966. Sl. No. 68 in the register reads as follows: "68—Shri Panch Kauri Ganguly..... 197—Sub. R. No. 3.50—272—72—3.00—27". So, Panchkari Ganguly became a member of this union from 1971 and he was a member of this union upto the end of 1972. The bank has, therefore, two registered unions of its workmen members, employed in the Calcutta branches of the bank. Since the end of 1972 the bank had 1710 clerical and sub-staff at Calcutta branches, and of them, 1698 workmen of the industry i.e. the Bank are members of the National and Grindlays Bank Employees' Union, whereas only 69 workmen of the industry are members of National and Grindlays Bank Staff union although Panchkari Ganguly, the workman concerned is a member of both the unions. Up to the end of 1972 the total number of workmen i.e. clerical and sub-staff in Calcutta branches are 1970 vide Ext. M 5. Of them, 1698 are members of the National and Grindlays Bank Employees' Union vide Ext. M 9. From 1710, if 1698 is deducted the balance remains at 12 only. Now, Ext. M 4 shows that the Staff Union upto 1972 has 69 members. Therefore, only 12 out of 69 are members exclusively of the Staff Union and the rest 57 are members of both the unions. So, the Staff Union has only 12 exclusive workmen members employed in the industry, whereas the other union has exclusive 1641 member workmen and 57 member workmen common to both the unions employed in the Bank. From this position it can be clearly stated that the National and Grindlays Bank Staff Union has only 12 exclusive member workmen employed in the industry whereas the other union has got 1641 exclusive workmen member employed in the industry. Exclusive members of the Employees' Union being 1641 and exclusive members of Staff Union being 12, the Staff union has got a microscopic minority of workmen members in such union compared to the workmen members of the other union. Members of both the unions are employed in the Calcutta branches of the Bank. If the number of workmen members who are exclusive members of the Employees' Union and who are exclusive members of the Staff Union is compared it works out as 1641 : 12-1.37 per cent i.e. the workmen members of the Staff Union compared to the workmen members of the Employees' union are in a microscopic minority as submitted by Mr. Bala. It should be noted that at least 56 common workmen members of both the unions do not support Staff union's espousing the cause of the individual workman (vide Ext. M 9). In support of his argument Mr. Bala referred to a decision of the Calcutta High Court in the case of Express Newspapers (Private) Ltd., and First Labour Court, West Bengal and others, 1969 1 LLJ, p. 600. At page 603 of the report his Lordship D. N. Sinha, as his Lordship then was, observed, "The whole point is as to whether the employer is fighting a dispute with a large number of his workmen. Until that test is passed, an individual dispute cannot be transformed into an industrial dispute". At page 604 of the report his Lordships observed, "I think the ordinary rule of throwing the

burden or onus should be followed, namely, as to who should fail if no evidence is given. When a workman is represented by an union of the workmen of the employer or a large portion thereof, and if the employer alleges that the union does not represent the views of the majority of the workmen or a large portion thereof, then in the first instance it would be for him to prove the same. But if it is admitted or not disputed that the union is not an union of the workmen of the particular employer or industry and if there is evidence on record, whether adduced by the employer or the employee, as to the constitution of such an union, then that evidence cannot be ignored". Further down his Lordship observed, "In fact, it seems to me on the materials that it is more or less admitted that only one workman belonging to the company is a member thereof and that is respondent 4 himself. On the proved fact that the union has for its members workmen belonging to various firms, banks, etc., the learned Judge fell into an error in deciding the case on the ground that the employer had failed to discharge his onus of showing that the union was incapable of representing the workmen so as to make it an industrial dispute". Further down his Lordship observed, "This union as constituted cannot represent the workmen concerned so as to transform a dispute between the workmen and the company which employ him, from an individual dispute into an industrial dispute. Only one workman of the company is a member of this union and there is no possibility of the company being faced with an industrial dispute with its workmen in general, as a result of the facts and circumstances, as they have happened in this case." In that case the workman was the only member of the union. In the present case the workman concerned is the member of both the unions and the Staff Union represents only 1.37 percent of the workmen members compared to workmen members of the other union. The employer has proved from the documents exhibited that the Staff Union has got only 12 exclusive members whereas the Employees' Union has 1641 exclusive members out of 1710 workmen. So, of the workmen members of both the unions, the Staff union represents a microscopic minority of workmen members employed by the industry, whereas the other union represents the largest majority of workmen members employed by the industry. Mr. Bala then relied on two decisions in the case of Pradip Lamp Works, Patna and Workmen of Pradip Lamp Works, Patna and another, reported in 1970 1 LLJ, p. 507 and Workmen of Indian Express Newspaper Private Ltd., vs The Management of Indian Express Private Ltd., reported in 1970 1 LLJ, p. 132, both of the Supreme Court and submitted that in view of those two decisions the Staff Union representing the individual workman's dispute cannot claim to have a representative character in regard to the workmen employed in the industry by the management of the bank. In Pradip Lamp case, 10 workmen were dismissed. The dispute was not sponsored by a registered union. There was clear evidence that large number of workmen, if not a majority of them, had formed a rival union. That was an unregistered union. It was clear from the evidence that at a meeting held on 9th December, 1963 at which the workmen forming the unregistered union gathered and passed a resolution electing 5 representatives to espouse the cause of 10 workmen. In pursuance of the authority given by a letter to the 5 representatives of workmen who gathered in the meeting held on 9th December, 1963 and passed the resolution for espousing the cause of dismissal of 10 workmen, the 5 representatives of workmen of the unregistered union took up the cause of 10 workmen for espousal of the dispute. The workmen complained that nothing was being done by the Conciliation officer against those dismissals and threatened a strike. Their Lordships found that a substantial number of workmen employed in the industry espoused the cause of dismissal of 10 workmen. At paragraph 8 of the report, page 510, their Lordships observed, "There are decisions of this Court which have laid down that espousal of dispute before a reference is made even by a minority union, having a membership of substantial number of workmen, is sufficient to make such a dispute an industrial dispute (See Workmen of Indian Express v. management—Civil Appeal No. 1733 of 1967 dated 26 November, 1968)". In the case of Indian Express Newspaper Private Limited (1970 1 LLJ p. 132) their Lordships after considering the decision of Bombay Union of Journalists v. The Hindu, Bombay, The Newspapers Ltd. vs The State Industrial Tribunal, U.P. (1957 S.C.R. 754) and Central Provinces Transport Services Ltd. v Raghunath Gopal Patwardhan (1956—S.C.R. 956), and Workmen vs Dharampal Premchand (1965 1 LLJ 528) observed, "... this Court after reviewing the previous decisions, distinguished the case of Hindu Bombay, and held that notwithstanding the width of the words used in S. 2(k) of

Act a dispute raised by an individual workman cannot become an industrial dispute unless it is supported either by his union or in the absence of a union by a number of workmen, that a union may validly raise a dispute though it may be a minority union of the workmen employed in an establishment that if there was no union of workmen in an establishment a group of employees can raise the dispute which becomes an industrial dispute even though it is a dispute relating to an individual workman, and lastly, that where the workmen of an establishment have no union of their own and some or all of them have joined a union of another establishment belonging to the same industry, if such a union takes up the cause of the workmen working in an establishment which has no union of its own, the dispute would become an industrial dispute if such a union can claim a representative character in a way that its support would make the dispute an industrial dispute". In the case of Indian Express newspaper (supra) in regard to the representative character of the union, consisting of member workmen of an industry, their Lordships observed at page 137 of the report, "If the number of working journalists in the respondent company were to be taken as 68, membership of the union by as many as 31 working journalists would certainly confer on the union a representative character. Even if the number of working journalists were to be taken as 131, it would not be unreasonable to say that 31 i.e., about 25 per cent of them, would, by becoming the members of the union, give a representative character to the union. . . . "Therefore, in accordance with the decisions in *The Workmen v. M/s. Dharampal Premchand* (supra) the union can be said to have a representative character qua the working journalists employed in the respondent company". Now, Mr. Bala submitted that having regard to the principles enunciated by their Lordships in the cases relied upon by the management, the Staff Union in the present case could never be considered to be of a representative character of the workmen employed in the industry in the category of clerk and subordinate staff. He pointed out that the Employees' Union i.e. the union of preponderating majority of the workmen members employed in the Bank, did not espouse the cause of the individual workman Panchkari Ganguly involved in this dispute. Therefore, those workmen members who are common members to both the unions, except the workman concerned, Panchkari Ganguly, i.e. numbering 56, did not also espouse the cause of the individual workman Panchkari Ganguly involved in this dispute. Only 12 exclusive members of the Staff union may, however, be considered to have espoused the cause of the individual workman Panchkari Ganguly. Thus 12 exclusive workmen members of the Staff Union, compared to 1641 exclusive members of the Employees' Union become a microscopic minority, compared to 1641 exclusive members of the Employees' Union and lose their representative character qua subordinate staff and clerical staff, employed by the management of the bank in Calcutta branches. Mr. Bala, therefore, submitted that he microscopic minority union i.e. the staff union cannot convert, by espousing the cause of an individual workman member of such union, an individual dispute into an industrial dispute i.e. collective dispute of workmen employed in the industry. Mr. Bala pointed out that there is no resolution of the Executive Committee of the Staff Union authorising the office bearers of the union or members of the Executive to espouse the cause of the individual workman involved in this case so as to convert the individual dispute into a collective dispute of workmen employed in the industry, i.e. industrial dispute. In *Indian Express Newspaper case* (1970 II L.J. p. 132) at page 137, it was observed by their Lordships "There can be no doubt that the union had taken up the cause of the two workmen by its executive committee passing the said resolution, and its office bearers have followed up the resolution by taking up the matter before the conciliation officer". Mr. Bala pointed out that the workman represented by Staff union did not produce any resolution of the Executive Committee of the union authorising its office bearers for taking up the cause of the individual workman Panchkari Ganguly involved in this case. So, he submitted, relying on the aforesaid observations of the Supreme Court, that the Staff Union's Executive Committee did not authorise by any resolution passed in its meeting any office bearer or any member of the Executive to espouse the cause of the workman Panchkari Ganguly involved in this case. Sri Singh was asked if he could produce the resolution of the Executive Committee. He could not answer on the point. So, I find that there was no resolution of the Executive Committee of the Staff union, authorising any of its office bearers or any of the members of the Executive to espouse the cause of the individual workman Panchkari Ganguly so as to transform the individual dispute into an industrial dispute. So, the act of the General Secretary Sri

Singh in the purported representation of the workman involved in this dispute while espousing his cause, as was found in the case of *Indian Express Newspaper's case* (supra), either before the management or before conciliatory authority, had been without any lawful authority of Executive of the union and the dispute, if any, that was raised by Sri Singh, as General Secretary of the Staff Union was, therefore, unwarranted by law in the absence of the authority of the resolution of the Executive Committee of the union for espousing the cause of the individual workman Panchkari Ganguly involved in this dispute by the union.

7. I find that the Executive Committee of the Staff Union did not hold any meeting and did not pass any resolution authorising any of its members or office bearers to espouse the cause of the individual workman member of the union Panchkari Ganguly so as to transform the individual dispute into a collective dispute i.e. industrial dispute. The General Secretary of the Staff Union who had, therefore, no authority to espouse the cause of the individual workman Panchkari Ganguly, cannot transform individual dispute of the workmen into a collective dispute. So, there has been no industrial dispute in the issue under reference and the dispute, if any is an individual dispute involving the individual workman concerned.

8. On the constitution of the reference as in the schedule to the order of reference Mr. Bala submitted that the workman involved in the dispute is a sub-staff. He claims that he is performing certain duties for which he should be promoted to the clerical grade. He referred to *Brooke Bond's case*, reported in 1966 I L.J. p. 402, Supreme Court. At page 405 of the report their Lordships observed, "generally speaking promotion is a management's function. But it may be recognised that there may be occasions when a tribunal may have to interfere with promotions made by the management where it is felt that person superseded have been so superseded on account of mala fides or victimisation. Even so, after a finding of mala fide or victimisation it is not the function of the tribunal to consider the merits of various employees itself and then decide whom to promote and whom not to promote. If any industrial tribunal finds that promotions have been made which are unjustified on the ground of mala fides or of victimisation, the proper course for it to take is to set aside the promotion and ask the management to consider the case of superseded employees and decide for itself whom to promote except of course the person whose promotion has been sent aside by the tribunal". Relying on the aforesaid observations of their Lordships of the Supreme Court and the constitution of the order of reference as in the schedule, Mr. Bala pointed out that it was not a case of supersession of any employee. The demand as in the issue constituted is only for promotion of Ganguly from the sub-staff cadre to clerical cadre. Had it been a case of supersession of the individual workman concerned in the case vis-a-vis the other eligibles of his cadre and that by management's indulging in mala fides or in victimisation of the individual workman concerned in this dispute, then there could be an industrial dispute in such a case. But the reference, as constituted, does not come within the ambit of the principle laid down in *Brooke Bond's case*. So, the reference as it stands constituted in the issue does not make out an industrial dispute in view of the principles laid down in *Brooke Bond's case*, since the reference as constituted does not show that the individual workman Panchkari Ganguly involved in this reference had been in any way victimised or that the management acted mala fide in preferring one in the category of sub-staff, other than the workman concerned, in promoting that one from the sub-staff cadre to the clerical cadre. Mr. Bala's submission is absolutely correct and I accept it.

9. The reference, as it is constituted is clearly a case in which the workman involved in the dispute claims that having regard to the nature of duties performed by him, though he is employed as a sub-staff, he should be given clerical grade or in other words, he should be promoted from sub-staff cadre to clerical cadre with all its benefits from certain date. So, it is clear case of promotion simpliciter and not a case of supersession by promoting one in a cadre in preference to any other of the same cadre. Therefore, on the principles laid down in *Brooke Bond's case* referred to above, the dispute referred to for adjudication as constituted in the issue is not an industrial dispute.

10. In *Indian Cable's case*, 1962 I L.J. p. 409 their Lordships observed at page 415, "what imparts to the dispute or a workman the character of industrial dispute is that it affects

the right of workmen as a class'. Keeping this observations of their Lordships of the Supreme Court in view in relation to the individual demand like the one at present i.e. the claim of an individual workman for promotion simpliciter from the sub-staff cadre to the clerical cadre, let us analyse the right of the individual sub-staff workman for promotion as well as of the entire body of workmen of the sub-staff cadre, employed by the Bank. The demand in the issue referred to for adjudication is of an individual sub-staff workman claiming for a right to promotion from sub-staff cadre to clerical cadre of the bank. It is not a reference that calls upon the tribunal to adjudicate upon a case of supersession of a workman or more than one workmen in preference to another workman, or more than one workmen in the matter of promotion. When the management acts mala fide or in victimisation of one workman in preference to the other in the matter of promotion the Brooke Bond's case has created a very limited right in the workman or workmen as a class in the matter of promotion in such a situation. At page 405 of the report the Supreme Court laid down the content and scope of the right of a workman, or of workmen as a class falling in a category, to promotion and observed, "Generally speaking . . . set aside by the tribunal" (see Brooke Bond's case supra the quotation in detail), [already quoted above]. The workmen in any lower category of an establishment or of an industry have no general right of promotion. The tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate which of the workmen of a lower category in an industry or in an establishment should be promoted in preference to other of the same category to any higher category of workmen. It is solely the business of the management. Only when there is a case as that observed by the Supreme court in Brooke Bond's case in the quotations quoted above, a tribunal could then interfere in the matter of promotion but not in any other case. So, the workmen as a class working in a lower category have no right common to all in such class for promotion to higher category as of their right. No workman of any lower category of workmen can as of right claim a right to be promoted from lower to any higher category of workmen. The question as to which of the workmen in the lower category is to be promoted to the higher category, when, how and under what terms and conditions is generally speaking the function of the management, and no workman in the lower category can as of right claim to be promoted to higher category. So, workmen in a lower category as a class have no right common to all for promotion to the higher category. Accordingly, if an individual workman of a lower category, or if workmen of such lower category forming a class, can have no right common to all of them for promotion from a lower category to a higher category in the jurisprudence of industrial law the mere sponsoring or espousing the demand of an individual workman of any lower category for promotion by a union of workmen, be it of majority of workmen members or of minority of workmen members, employed in an industry, would not enable a workman of lower category of workmen of such category as a class to claim a right common to them as a class for promotion from lower to higher category so as to metamorphose an individual workman's alleged claim for right to promotion from lower category to higher category into a class or collective claim for such right common to workmen of the lower category to which an individual workman belongs. If a right common to all workmen of a category is trampled upon by denial of such right to an individual workman of that category by the management, then the espousal of the cause of such individual workman of that category by a union of such workmen affected by such action of the management may transform the individual dispute into a collective dispute of the workmen members of the union of that category. But when an individual workman of a particular category and his co-workers can have no claim for a right common to them as a class, no question of affecting any collective right of workmen as a class arises, if and when any individual workman's demand for a claim of a non claimable right is met with management's refusal. So, by mere espousal of the cause of an individual workman in such a situation by any union of workmen would not convert the alleged individual dispute into a collective or an industrial dispute. Certain rights of workmen are common—wages, bonus, leave, rest, gratuities, etc. Denial of such common right to an individual may affect workmen as a class. But claim for a right to promotion is not a right common to all workmen. Only in case where workmen listed as eligible for promotion from the lower to the higher category and the management in preferring some of the workmen of that category to other for promotion, acts mala fide or in victimisation of

some in preference to the other or in unfair labour practice, such actions of the management in such a situation affect the right of all who are eligible for promotion from lower to higher category as also the individuals who have been affected by such management's action. Espousal of an individual workman's case in such a particular situation by the union of workmen of the industry would convert the individual dispute into a collective dispute. Management's action in such a situation affects the right common to all workmen of a particular category who are listed as eligible for promotion as they all can claim management's fair and square, and equal treatment to all eligibles for promotion. Judging from this aspect the cause of Panchkari Ganguly, the concerned workman involved in the dispute does not fall within the principle which I have just discussed, based on the decision in Indian Cable's case. Panchkari Ganguly has not been superseded in preference to any one in the category of the sub-staff of the bank. So, mere demand by him or by the union of which he is a member that having regard to the nature of the duties performed by him, though, he is employed as a subordinate staff, he should be given clerical grade or in other words promoted to the clerical grade cannot, per se, in the terms of the issue referred to for adjudication be considered as an industrial dispute in view of what I have just discussed.

11. Now, in the issue as constituted in the schedule to the order of reference it has not been stated that the sub-staff Panchkari Ganguly had ever been entrusted with any duty that is to be performed by an employee in the clerical cadre. The issue amongst other things says, "having regard to the nature of duties performed by Panchkari Ganguly, a subordinate staff of the Church Lane branch, Calcutta . . ." Analysing this part of the issue it would be found that Panchkari Ganguly is employed as a subordinate staff of the bank by the Bank. It is not stated in the issue that Ganguly was entrusted with any duty by the bank or assigned with duty by the bank, other than the duties of a subordinate staff. So, on the issue as constituted we must first start with the admitted situation that Panchkari Ganguly is a member of the subordinate staff of the Bank. In Sastry award Chapter VII there is the scales of pay for subordinate staff and gradations and nomenclatures of the members of the sub-staff. Grade I sub-grade A—subordinate staff general e.g., Peon, bearers, messengers, sweepers, sepoy, hamals, darwans, cycle peons, etc. Grade I sub-grade B—Jamadar, havildar, head-messenger, armed guard, head peon, liftman, driver, electrician, air-condition plant subordinates. Now, the issue says that Panchkari Ganguly is a subordinate staff. It does not say whether he is in Grade I sub-grade A or grade I sub-grade B sub-staff. In grade I sub-grade A the nomenclatures of subordinate staff are there, so also in grade I. Holders of posts in the sub-grades by the names of the posts themselves are required to perform those duties that can't be performed by clerks, sub-grade B (see Chapter VII, p. 40 of Sastry award). Chapter VI, p. 31 of the Sastry award entitles—scales of pay of clerical staff. So clerical staff and subordinate staff are two distinct and distinguishable cadres of workmen, one excluding the other. The management of the bank has a system of recruitment of clerk and promotion of sub-staff to clerical cadre. Ext. 177 is the notice regarding recruitment of clerical staff. Clause C of the notice says, "any member of the subordinate staff who is sufficiently literate or qualified may sit in bank's modified test and those who achieve a satisfactory pass will be placed in the clerical grade on probation in a branch other than the one in which he has served". This notice is dated 25th September, 1972. The Regional Manager of the bank in his evidence stated in examination-in-chief, "The workman concerned did not apply in response to the notice just produced". Sri Singh, General Secretary of the union representing the workman relied on Lloyd Bank's case, 1961 I LLJ p. 18 and Paragraph 630 of Sastry award and submitted that as sub-staff Panchkari Ganguly the concerned workman was performing the duties of a clerk, he should be promoted to the clerical grade, and that the management's denial of promotion to him was prejudicial to his interest. I have already pointed out that the issue referred to for adjudication begins with the words "having regard to the nature of duties performed by Panchkari Ganguly, a subordinate staff of the Church Lane Branch", and that within the scope and content of this clause in the issue referred to for adjudication it would not be found that any duty was entrusted to Panchkari Ganguly other than the duty to be performed by a subordinate staff, be he either of grade I A or grade I B of Sastry award. In the clause referred to above as appearing in the issue referred to for

adjudication there is no word indicating that the duties that are claimed to be performed by the workman were assigned by the bank and on such assignment the workman performed the duties. Lloyds Bank's case and Punjab National Bank's case (1961 I LLJ p. 18 and 1961 II LLJ p. 162 respectively) relate to interpretation of paragraph 164(b), Category IX of Sastri award. In Punjab National Bank's case the issue which was referred to for adjudication to the industrial tribunal was whether the special allowance granted by the appellant to Sood a clerk was adequate having regard to the nature of his duties and responsibility and the emoluments paid to persons discharging similar duties and responsibilities in other banks of similar status, if not what amount of special allowance should be granted to him. Their Lordships at page 164 of the report, left hand column, observed: "Our decisions, therefore, should be read solely in the light of case made out by the respondent Sood. If the tellers employed by the appellant think that they are entitled to claim additional allowance having regard to the nature of duties assigned to them and having regard to the salaries paid to officers discharging corresponding functions in other banks, it would be open to them to make an appropriate demand in that behalf, and if such a demand is referred for industrial adjudication, that no doubt would be tried on the merits unaffected by our decision in the present appeal. The only point which we are deciding in the present appeal is that having regard to the material produced by the parties in the present case Sood cannot be said to hold a supervisory post so as to take his case under Para 164 of the Sastri award." Within the observations quoted above their Lordships used the following words, "if the tellers employed by the appellant". Sood's case was that the duties performed by him put him in the class of a supervisor and was to be paid the allowance as per paragraph 164(b) clause IX of Sastri award. Their Lordships examined the duties assigned to Sood and performed by him. The assignment of duties must have been made by the bank the court found that he could not be classed as a supervisor. Lloyds Bank's case was explained in Punjab National Bank's case wherein their Lordships at page 164 of the report (1961 II LLJ p. 162) observed, "Even so this court held that the checking of books on which reliance was placed was purely mechanical and that the functions assigned to the audit clerks did not include any supervisory functions at all". So, in both the cases their Lordships pin pointed the issue on the words "nature and duties of the functions assigned to the employee". In Lloyds Bank's case three employees were merely clerks. In Sood's case, Sood was also a clerk. The nature and duties of the functions assigned to clerks in both the cases and performed by them were held by their Lordships as that that they could not be clothed with the status of supervisor. The dispute raised in both the cases as an industrial dispute was rejected by their Lordships by those two decision. In the subsequent cases relating to Banks, such as, State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur vs. Gopal Parekh, State Bank of Bikaner vs. Khandelwal and State Bank of Bikaner vs. Bhargava, two criteria have been pin pointed by their Lordships of the Supreme Court, first assignment of a status and performance of duties attached to such status. Both must co-exist to entitle a workman to claim that he has been assigned a particular status in a particular category of workmen and has performed the duties of the functions assigned and attached to such status. This is the quintessence of the principle that could be gathered from the decisions on the bank employees' cases so far discussed. In the present reference, the issue, as constituted, does not indicate that the sub-staff Panchkari Ganguly, the workman, was assigned with a status of a clerk by the bank and as such, he was performing the duties of the functions so assigned. In Sood's case, Sood, being employed as a clerk assigned with certain duties he had been performing, could not claim on that account that he was to be considered as a supervisor, and the demand raised based on such claim was held by their Lordships in Punjab National Bank's case as that it did not constitute an industrial dispute. In Lloyds Bank's case also the clerks were not assigned with the functions attached to supervisors. So, their claim that they were performing certain duties for which they should be ranked as supervisors was rejected by their Lordships, as not constituting a dispute which could be called an industrial dispute.

12. The Sastri award would show that clerical staff and subordinate staff are two distinct and different categories of workmen. Sri Singh relied on paragraph 530 of Sastri award, vide page 148, which reads as follows: "The workmen's demand that persons who have studied upto the pre-matric class should be eligible for promotion to appointment

in the lower clerical grade is based upon the assumption that this Tribunal following the Sen Award will insist upon the passing of matriculation or an examination equivalent to it as the minimum qualification. As we have not given any such direction it is not necessary to deal with this demand. It will however suffice to recommend that such members of the subordinate staff as are sufficiently literate and intelligent should be considered for promotion to the clerical grade." I have already pointed out that the bank issued a general notice, Ext. M7—recruitment of clerical staff, and by clause C thereof the bank invited any member of the subordinate who is sufficiently literate or qualified to sit in the bank's modified test, and assured those who would achieve a satisfactory pass that they would be placed in the clerical grade on probation in a branch other than the one in which they had served. So, the bank in pursuance of the recommendations of the Sastri award in paragraph 530 thereof had invited on 25th September, 1972 applications from members of the subordinate staff to appear in a modified test for promotion to the clerical grade. But the workman Panchkari Ganguly did not apply in response to that notification. The dispute was referred to adjudication on 25th October, 1972. The notification Ext. M7 is dated 25th September, 1972 i.e. a month before the dispute was referred to for adjudication. If the workman who is in the subordinate staff considered himself sufficiently literate or qualified, he would have certainly sit for the bank's modified test for promotion to the clerical grade. But he dared not sitting in such a test. The bank followed the Sastri Award recommendations appearing in paragraph 530 and invited all workmen of sub-staff grade to sit for the modified test for promotion, to the clerical grade. It is for the workman Ganguly to explain why he did not sit for the examination. The only presumption that this tribunal can draw from the conduct of the workman Ganguly is that he is not sufficiently literate or qualified so that he could dare sitting in the modified test for promotion from the subordinate grade to the clerical grade. The union cannot make any grievance against the bank's action. The issue as referred to for adjudication does not in any way indicate that the workman who is in the subordinate staff had been assigned by the bank any duty that is usually to be performed by a clerk. So if the subordinate staff voluntarily and of his own accord signed some papers or wrote some papers of the bank, he did so without any assignment of such function. In the issue the workman is described as "a subordinate staff". The dispute as referred to for adjudication is only a claim of a subordinate staff for promotion to clerical grade. The dispute does not relate to any case of supersession of any subordinate staff eligible for promotion to clerical grade. The workman in the subordinate staff, as I have already held, can not as of right claim promotion to clerical grade. As recommended by Sastri award in paragraph 530, the employer should afford opportunities to any member of the subordinate staff, who is literate or qualified, for promotion to the clerical grade. Following that recommendation the bank i.e. the employer in this case issued notice inviting any member of the subordinate staff who is literate or qualified to sit for the modified test for promotion to the clerical grade. It was for the workman to act in response to such a notice of the bank which was issued a month before the alleged dispute was referred to for adjudication. Sri Singh could have no grievance against the bank when the bank gave ample opportunity a month before the dispute was referred to for adjudication to the workman concerned to sit for the modified test for promotion from the subordinate cadre to clerical cadre. The bank cannot force any of its sub-staff to sit for the examination. It was the sub-staff's duty to sit for the examination. The boot is, therefore, on the other leg. The individual dispute of the workman Panchkari Ganguly, referred to for adjudication, even of espoused by the Staff union, failed to assume the character of an industrial dispute, viewed from the different aspects, as discussed above.

13. Mr. Bala next contended relying on the decision of the Supreme Court in Sindhu Resettlement Corporation Ltd. and Industrial Tribunal, Gujarat & Ors., 1968 I LLJ p. 834 and Fedders Lloyd Corporation Private Ltd. and Lt. Governor, Delhi & Ors., F.I.R. 1970(20) p. 343, and Raju's Caffe, Coimbatore and others vs. Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore and another, 1951 I LLJ p. 219 that the demand, relating to the dispute referred to for adjudication had not been served on the management either by the workman or by the union espousing the cause of the workman, before the union espousing the cause of the workman had approached the conciliatory authority for conciliation of the dispute.

So, Mr. Bala contended that the dispute referred to for adjudication did not constitute on the authority of the decisions upon which he had relied, an industrial dispute within Sec. 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act. The workman Panchkari Ganguly came to prove three documents. He handed over a letter to the letter receiving department of the office of the National and Grindlays Bank, Church Lane but he could not remember to whom he had handed over the letter. He handed over such letter on 14-9-65. The person who received the letter gave an initial on the copy of such letter which the witness could not read. On the initial in the copy of such letter there is the date 14-9-65 and a rubber stamp impression reading "Cover not verified, National and Grindlays Bank, Church Lane, Calcutta". Witness wrote the original letter and signed it so also its copy. What he proved before the tribunal is a copy and what he delivered to the office of the bank is the original letter. He said that on the letter i.e. the copy marked (Ext. W1, subject to objection) there is an initial with date and rubber stamp. Then witness proved, Ext. W2, (subject to objection). It is the office copy of a reminder of a letter which he claimed to have had written to the Manager, of which the copy he proved, being Ext. W1 (subject to objection). He could not remember to whom he delivered it but there is a seal and an initial and a date on the letter. The seal reads as "National and Grindlays Bank, 6, Church Lane, Calcutta". He could not say who initialled on the seal. Then the witness attempted to prove a letter which is an office copy marked X for identification. He said "this is the office copy of a letter written by the General Secretary". There is nothing in the letter to show who the General Secretary is and of which concern. The witness delivered the original of the said letter to the receiving section of the General Manager's office of National and Grindlays Bank limited situated at 19, Netaji Subhas Road. He cannot name the person to whom he had delivered the original of the letter. There is a rubber stamp impression with an initial on this office copy of the letter with the date. The rubber stamp impression reads as "National and Grindlays Bank Ltd., 19, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta." The witness could not decipher the initial (letter marked X for identification). In cross-examination the witness admitted that the original of the letter of which the office copy is Ext. W1 was not called for from the management. He further stated, "None of the original of the three letters, being office copies, over which I have deposed, had been called for by me in this proceeding from the management". The tribunal asked the witness a question which reads as follows:

Ques.: Is there any reference of the letter dated 14-9-65 in the letter dated 3rd March, 1972 which you say is a reminder of the earlier letter i.e. in relation to the letter dated 14-9-65?

Ans.: I did not refer in the second letter dated 3rd March, 1972 my earlier letter dated 14-9-65 the copy of which I have only proved."

So, the office copies of the three letters the originals of each of which the witness claimed that he had delivered at the office of the bank had not been called for by the workman represented by the Staff Union from the management of the bank. Accordingly, the office copies cannot be legally considered as have been duly proved, and cannot be admitted in evidence. In Ext. W1 dated 14-9-65 the workman detailed certain duties which he claimed that he was performing and then he stated, "I think that above duties are wholly clerical, hence I request you to treat me as clerk and pay me salary for the same cadre. I shall be highly obliged to you, if you consider my case favourably". In this letter he did not state that though he was employed as a subordinate staff, he was assigned with the duties of a clerk and that being so assigned with the duties of a clerk he was performing such duties. In the letter Ext. W2, which the witness claimed to be the reminder of the letter Ext. W1, he says "Most respectfully I beg to inform that you are fully aware that I have been performing the duties of a clerk while issuing the cheque books to customers with effect from January, 1965. Therefore, I request you to treat me as a clerk from the period I performed the duties and reimburse the monetary benefit to me from the aforesaid period, as soon as possible". This letter does not mention that he had written the letter Ext. W1, office copy dated 14-9-65 to the Manager of National and Grindlays Bank Ltd., 6 Church Lane, Calcutta. The third letter which could not be proved even was marked X for identification. Under "yours faithfully" in the letter marked X for identification, there is one

initial 'AS' then the words 'General Secretary'—all typed. The signatory of the letter appears to be the General Secretary. It cannot be gathered as to who this General Secretary is. Is he the General Secretary of any industrial concern? or General Secretary of any union? or General Secretary of any club? If the General Secretary is of a registered trade union, then there is no common seal in the letter marked X for identification indicating the name of the union and its registration number. The first paragraph of the letter speaks of Ganguly's performing the duties of a clerk while issuing the cheque books to the customers of the bank, with effect from January, 1965. The second paragraph speaks about Ganguly's making several representations to the authorities for treating him as a clerk and for reimbursing him with the benefit arising out of it, but with no results. The third paragraph reads as, "Therefore we request you to enquire into the matters and fulfill his demand. In case we do not hear from you within ten days from the receipt of this letter, it shall be deemed that you also refuse his claim". To whom the Manager of National and Grindlays Bank Ltd., 19, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1 would send the reply of such a letter? The person signing the office copy of the letter as the General Secretary did not disclose in the letter his particulars & address. So, this document marked X for identification is a spurious document. It does not indicate that any General Secretary of any, registered union is making the request on behalf of the workman concerned, or making any demand relating to the dispute under reference while espousing the cause of the workman concerned, to the management of the bank. 'We request' in the third paragraph of the letter carries no sense at all. The word 'we' means General Secretary of an undisclosed body. If letter marked X for identification is the office copy of the original letter which the workman claimed to have had delivered to the receiving section of the bank's office at 19, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta, then that original letter could not be a whit different from the letter marked X for identification. As the original letter, which I presume was the replica of the letter marked X for identification, that original letter could not be a charter of demand relating to the issue referred to for adjudication by this tribunal, served by any General Secretary of any registered trade union of which the workman concerned is a member, espousing the cause of the workman concerned relating to the demand made in the issue referred to for adjudication. Sri Singh was asked to explain this situation. He submitted that the original of the letters were not called for from the management. He, however, stated that it was he who had signed the original as well as the office copy marked X for identification. If that be the fact the original letter of which the document marked X for identification is the copy cannot be considered to be a charter of demand served by the General Secretary of a registered trade union, while espousing the cause of the workman Panchkari Ganguly in relation to the matter in dispute, as constituted in the issue, referred to for adjudication by this tribunal. The office copy of the letter marked X for identification does not show on the very face of it that the person signing as General Secretary is the General Secretary of a registered trade union i.e. of the National and Grindlays Bank Staff Union. Accordingly, original of this letter marked X for identification cannot show that the General Secretary who signed that original letter is the General Secretary of the registered trade union named National and Grindlays Bank Staff Union. Therefore, there was no service of the charter of demand on behalf of the individual workman concerned in this dispute by the union, named National and Grindlays Bank Staff Union, claiming to espouse the cause of such workman. There must first be service of the charter of demand on the management, which is the first procedural step to be taken in raising an industrial dispute (vide Raju's Caffe's case before approaching the conciliatory authority with the demand on behalf of the workman. If any registered trade union claims to espouse the cause of an workman or workmen it must first serve a charter of demand on the authority of the management, i.e. the employer that can concede to or refuse the demand. If the authority of the management on being served with the charter of demand relating to a workman or workmen whose cause has been espoused by a registered trade union, refuse to accede to the demand, then with that demand the union may approach the conciliatory authority. If the conciliation fails and the conciliatory authority reports failure to the appropriate Government, the appropriate Government is then Competent to decide whether there is in existence of an industrial dispute or apprehension of an industrial dispute arising and may decide to refer such a dispute relating to such demand in the issue set forth in the schedule to the order of reference for adjudication by the competent

adjudicatory authority as the case may be (*vide* Sindhu Resettlement case and Fedder Lloyd's case). In the present case, the dispute is an individual dispute. The union i.e. the National and Grindlays Bank Staff union claims to have espoused the cause of the individual workman's demand. The workman failed to establish that the union, espousing its cause had served the charter of demand relating to the issue referred to for adjudication by this tribunal on the management, before approaching the conciliatory authority. Therefore, the dispute referred to for adjudication falling within the principles laid down in Raju's Case, Sindhu Resettlement case and Fedder Lloyd's case referred to above, is not an industrial dispute.

14 Mr. Bala submitted that there is no resolution of the Executive Committee of the Staff union indicating that the Executive committee of the union on the complaint of the workman concerned decided to take up its cause as a common cause of the workman of the category of sub-staff, and that in pursuance of such resolution espoused the cause of the individual workman. So, he relied on a decision in the case of Bangalore Woollen, Cotton and Silk Mills Company Ltd. and their workmen and another, reported in 1968 1 LLJ p 514. The workman did not produce nor the Staff Union representing the workman either the resolution of the Executive Committee of the Staff Union or the constitution of the Staff Union. In the Mysore case at page 516 their Lordships of the Division Bench of Mysore High Court observed: "It is therefore clear from the constitution of the first party union that any aggrieved workman of the second party company may lodge a complaint against it in writing to the secretary of the union and seek for necessary relief and it is the duty of the secretary to forthwith place it before the executive committee of the union for its consideration and if the executive committee thinks it worth while to espouse the cause of the workman and passes a resolution to that effect, his further duty is to carry out that decision. In the instant case I must say, all that has happened. Apart from the executive committee in its meetings on 8 and 21 July, 1966 considering the question of raising an industrial dispute in regard to the termination of the workman Ramachandran by the second party concern and calling upon the workman to lodge a complaint under S. 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act before the industrial tribunal where an industrial dispute between the workman and the management of the second party concern as per Exts W 5(a) and 5(b), it has pursued the matter after the disposal of the writ petition in its meeting on 25 February, 1960 and authorised the office-bearers to demand the reinstatement of Ramachandran, as Ext. W. 5(c). All this has been done in conformity with the provisions of the constitution of the first party union, namely Ex. W.1. In the circumstances, it must be said that the first party union which is exclusively the union of the employees of the second party concern, has taken up the case of the aggrieved workman A. Ramchandran and, therefore, his individual dispute has developed into an industrial dispute and so this Court is competent to proceed with the reference..." In the present case no resolution of the Executive Committee of the Staff Union and no constitution of the Staff Union have been filed and proved by the workman. The demand in the issue under reference had not been served by the union espousing the cause of the individual workman upon the management of the bank before approaching the conciliatory authority with the demand under the issue referred to for adjudication by this tribunal. Therefore, the dispute referred to for adjudication by this tribunal has also not been clothed with insignia of an industrial dispute within Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

15. Upon considering the different aspects as was argued by Mr. Bala, and by Sri Singh representing the workman, I hold that the dispute referred to for adjudication is not an industrial dispute within Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Therefore, this tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain and to adjudicate upon the dispute as referred to for adjudication. In the result, the reference is rejected.

This is my award

S. N. BAGCHI Presiding Officer.
[No. 1-12012/131/72/LR III]

Dated, the 16th June, 1973.
46 G of I/73-6.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2043.—यतः व्यास बांध प्रायोजना, तलवाड़ा से सम्बद्ध श्रमिकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व श्रमिक यूनियन, व्यास बांध प्रायोजना, तलवाड़ा करती है, एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः उक्त नियोजकों और कर्मकारों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (1) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में एक लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को उसमें वर्णित व्यक्ति के माध्यस्थता के लिए निर्दिष्ट करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त माध्यस्थता करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार को भेजी गई है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त माध्यस्थता करार को, जो उसे 27 जून, 1973 को मिला था, एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करती है ।

(करार)

(औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन)

के बीच

पक्षकारों के नाम

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले श्री सरदार लाल, पी०एम०ई०आई०, कार्यकारी इंजीनियर, कामिक व्यास बांध प्रायोजना तलवाड़ा ।

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले : श्री दीनत मित्र चौहान, महासचिव, श्रमिक यूनियन, व्यास बांध प्रायोजना, तलवाड़ा, कम्बा ।

मुख्य पक्षकारों के बीच निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद को श्री टी० टी० नयाडे, उप-मुख्य श्रमायुक्त (केन्द्रीय) नई दिल्ली के माध्यस्थता के लिए निर्दिष्ट करने का एतद्वारा करार किया गया है ।

(1) त्रिनिटि विवादग्रस्त विषय "क्या व्यास बांध प्रायोजना तलवाड़ा, जिला होशियारपुर में श्रमिक शमन सेवा में नियोजित कर्मकारों की पहली जून, 1965 में प्रारम्भित 8 घंटे की हड़ती की मांग और उसके परिणामस्वरूप समयोपरि भले का दावा व्यापक है ? यदि हाँ, तो किस तारीख से और किस सीमा तक ?"

(2) विवाद के पक्षकारों का विवरण, जिसमें अन्तर्निहित स्थापना का नाम 1 व्यास बांध प्रायोजना, तलवाड़ा कम्बा, जिला होशियारपुर ।

उपक्रम का नाम और पता भी 2 श्रमिक यूनियन व्यास बांध प्रायोजना, तलवाड़ा कम्बा, जिला होशियारपुर ।

(3) यदि कोई मध्य प्रश्नगत कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करना हो तो तलवाड़ा कम्बा, जिला होशियारपुर ।

(4) प्रभावित उपक्रम में नियोजित कर्मकारों की कुल संख्या :

16000 ।

- (5) विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित या संभाव्यतः प्रभावित होने वाले कर्मकारों की प्राक्कलित संख्या।

(हम यह करार भी करते हैं कि मध्यस्थ का विनिर्णय हम पर आबद्धकर होगा। मध्यस्थम् अपना पंचाट तीन मास की कालावधि या इतने और समय के भीतर जो हमारे बीच पारस्परिक लिखित करार द्वारा बढ़ाया जाय, वेगा। यदि पूर्व वर्णित कालावधि के भीतर पंचाट नहीं बिया जाता तो माध्यस्थम् के लिए निदेश स्वतः रद्द हो जायगा और हम नये माध्यस्थम् के लिए बातचीत करने को स्वतंत्र होंगे।)

पक्षकारों के हस्ताक्षर

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले :

ह०/- (सरदारी लाल)

कार्यकारी इंजीनियर—कामिक

व्यास बांध प्रायोजना, तलवाड़ा।

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले :

ह०/- दाulat सिंह चौहान,

2-5-73

सहा (सचिव, श्रमिक यूनियन, व्यास बांध

प्रायोजना, जलवाड़ा कस्बा।

साक्षी :

1. ह०/- कुलदीप सिंह

कामिक अधिकारी, व्यास बांध

प्रयोजना, तलवाड़ा,

2. ह०/- किरण सोनी

[संख्या एल०/42012/16/73-एल० आर०-3]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th July, 1973

S.O. 2045.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to Beas Dam Project, Talwara and its workmen represented by Workers Union, Beas Dam Project, Talwara.

And, whereas the said employers and workmen have, by a written agreement, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration by the persons specified therein, and a copy of the said arbitration agreement has been forwarded to the Central Government.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said arbitration agreement which was received by it on the 27th June, 1973.

AGREEMENT

(Under Section 10-A of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947)

BETWEEN

Name of the parties :

Representing Employer—Shri Sardari Lal, PSFI, Executive Engineer—Personnel, Beas Dam Project, Talwara.

Representing Workmen—Shri Daulat Singh Chauhan, General Secretary, Workers Union, Beas Dam Project, Talwara Township.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following Industrial Dispute to the Arbitration of Shri T. T. Fayade, Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), New Delhi.

- (i) Specific matters in dispute. “Whether the demand of the workmen employed in the Fire Fighting Service at Beas Dam Project, Talwara District Hoshiarpur for 8 hours duty per day with effect from 1st June, 1965 and consequential claim for over time is justified? If so, from what date and to what extent?”
- (ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved.
- (iii) Name of the Union, if any representing the workmen in question.
- (iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking.
- (v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute.
1. Beas Dam Project, Talwara Township, District Hoshiarpur.
2. Workers Union, Beas Dam Project, Talwara Township, Distt. Hoshiarpur.
- Workers Union, Beas Dam Project, Talwara Township, District Hoshiarpur.
- 16,000
- 35

(We further agree that the decision of the Arbitrator, shall be binding on us. The arbitrator shall make his award within a period of three months or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period aforementioned, the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration).

Signatures of the Parties.

Representing Employer :

Sd/-

SARDARI LAL, Executive Engineer—Personnel,

Representing Workmen :

Sd/-

DAULAT SINGH CHAUHAN, General Secy. 2-5-73.

General Secretary, Workers Union, Beas Dam Project, Talwara Township.

Witnesses :

1. Sd/- Kuldeep Singh,

Personnel Officer, Beas Dam Project, Talwara.

2. Sd/- Kiran Sone.

[No. L. 42012/16/73/LR III]

आदेश

क्र० आ० 2046.—यतः व्यास डैम प्रोजेक्ट, तलवाड़ा से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व व्यास प्रोजेक्ट वर्क्स यूनियन फ्रण्ट, तलवाड़ा करता है, एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः उक्त नियोजकों और कर्मकारों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (1) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में एक लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को उसमें वर्णित व्यक्ति के माध्यस्थम् के लिए निर्दिष्ट करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त माध्यस्थम् करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार को भजी गई है;

अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम, की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त माध्यस्थम् करार को, जो उसे 26 जून, 1973 को मिला था, एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करती है।

(करार)

ORDER

(औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन)

(बै. बी. सी.)

पक्षकारों के नाम :

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले 1. श्री सरदारी लाल, कार्यकारी अभियंता-कामिक, तालवाड़ा कस्बा।

2. श्री कुलदीप सिंह, कामिक अधि-कारी, व्यास डैम, तालवाड़ा।

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले: श्री सन्तोख सिंह, महा-सचिव, वर्कर्स यूनाइटेड फ्रंट, तालवाड़ा।

पक्षकारों के बीच निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद को श्री टी. टी. तायडे, मुख्य श्रमायुक्त (केन्द्रीय), नई दिल्ली के मध्यस्थ के लिए निर्देशित करने का एतद्द्वारा करार किया गया है।

- (1) विनिश्चित विवाद प्रस्तुत विषय. "क्या दरों की सामान्य सूची को मू. सख्या 2.3 के अधीन व्यास डैम प्रोजेक्ट, तालवाड़ा में विद्युत संबंधी व्यवसायों पर नियोजित सहायक फोरमन 160-400 रुपये के वेतन मान के हकदार है? यदि हाँ, तो किस तारीख से?"
- (2) विवाद के पक्षकारों का विवरण, 1. व्यास डैम प्रोजेक्ट तालवाड़ा।
जिनमें अन्तर्गत स्थापन या 2. व्यास प्रोजेक्ट, वर्कर्स यूनाइटेड फ्रंट, तालवाड़ा।
उपक्रम का नाम और पता भी सम्मिलित है।
- (3) यदि कोई सख प्रत्यक्ष कर्मकारो व्यास प्रोजेक्ट वर्कर्स यूनाइटेड फ्रंट, तालवाड़ा।
का प्रतिनिधित्व करता हो, तो उसका नाम।
- (4) प्रभावित उपक्रम में नियोजित 16000
कर्मकारों की कुल संख्या।
- (5) विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित या 2।
समाव्यतः प्रभावित होने वाले कर्मकारों की प्राक्कलित संख्या।

हम यह करार भी करते हैं कि मध्यस्थ का विनिश्चय हम पर बाध्यकर होगा।

मध्यस्थ अपना पचास तीन मास की कालावधि या दत्तने और समय के भीतर जो हमारे बीच पारस्परिक लिखित करार द्वारा बढ़ाया जाय, देगा। यदि पूर्व वर्णित कालावधि के भीतर पचास नहीं दिया जाता तो मध्यस्थ के लिए निवेद्य स्वतः रद्द हो जायगा और हम नए मध्यस्थ के लिए बातचीत करने को स्वतंत्र होंगे।

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले

ह० - सरदारी लाल

ह० - सन्तोख सिंह

ह० - कुलदीप सिंह

28-4-73

28-4-73

साक्षी :

1. ह० - करनैल सिंह

2. ह० - राम लोबाया

S.O. 2046.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to Beas Dam Project, Talwara and its workmen represented by Beas Project Workers United Front, Talwara.

And, whereas the said employers and workmen have, by a written agreement, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration by the person specified therein, and a copy of the said arbitration agreement has been forwarded to the Central Government.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said arbitration agreement which was received by it on the 26th June, 1973.

AGREEMENT

(Under Section 10-A of the Industrial Dispute Act-1947)
BETWEEN

Name of the parties :

Representing Employer—1. Shri Sardari Lal, Executive Engineer—Personnel, Talwara Township.

2. Shri Kuldip Singh, Personnel Officer, Beas Dam, Talwara.

Representing Workmen.—1. Shri Santokh Singh, Secretary, General Worker's United Front, Talwara.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following Industrial dispute to the Arbitration of Shri T. T. Tayade, Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), New Delhi.

(i) Specific matter in dispute "Whether the Assistant Foreman employed on the Electrical trades at the Beas Dam Project, Talwara are entitled to the scale of Rs. 160-400 under item No. 2 of Common Schedule of Rates? If so, from what date?"

(ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the name of and address of the establishment or undertaking involved.

(iii) Name of the Union, if any representing the workmen in question.

(iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected.

(v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute.

We further agree that the decision of the Arbitrator shall be binding on us.

The Arbitrator shall make his award within a period of three months or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period aforementioned the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration.

Representing Employers:

Sd/- SARDARI LAL.

Sd/- KULDIP SINGH
28/4/1973

Representing workmen :

Sd/- SANTOKH SINGH
28/4/1973

Witnesses :

1. Sd/- Karnail Singh.

2. Sd/- Ram Lobaya.

[संख्या एल०-42012/24/73-एल० आर० 3]

[No. L. 42012/24/73/LR III]

New Delhi, the 9th July, 1973

S.O. 2047.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 3), Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between Sri Chandan Mal Jain, Managing Contractor of Golden Sinidih Colliery, Post Office Nawagarh, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th July, 1973.

**CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT NO. 3, DHANBAD**

Reference No. 44 of 1970

Present :

Shri B. S. Tripathi—Presiding Officer.

Parties :

The employers in relation to the Management of Golden Sinidih Colliery represented by Sri Chandan Mal Jain, Managing Contractor of that Colliery.

AND

Their workmen represented by Mine Mazdoor Union, P.O. Sijua, Dist. Dhanbad.

Appearances :

For Employers—Shri P. N. Thakur, Advocate.

For Workmen—Shri Prasanta Burman, Vice-President of Mine Mazdoor Union.

Industry : Coal.

State : Bihar

Dhanbad, the 27th June, 1973.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, Employment & Rehabilitation (Department of Labour & Employment) being of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between Sri Chandan Mal Jain, Managing Contractor of Golden Sinidih Colliery, P. O. Nawagarh, Dist. Dhanbad and his workmen in respect of the matters specified in the schedule of reference, by their order No.2/30/70-LR(I) dated 19-8-70 referred the said dispute under Section 10(1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to this Tribunal for adjudication. The schedule is extracted below :—

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of Shri Chandan Mal Jain, Managing Contractor of Golden Sinidih Colliery, P.O. Nawagarh, Dist. Dhanbad in stopping Shri Rama Murthy Singh, Munshi, with effect from the 17th December, 1969, from work is justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled”.

2. The reference was received in this Tribunal on 5-9-1970 when it was registered as Reference No. 44 of 1970. The industrial dispute in question was sponsored by Mine Mazdoor Union and the same Union represented the workmen in the present proceeding. The written statement of the workmen was received in this Tribunal on 2-11-1970. The written statement of the employer i.e. the Managing Contractor Sri Chandan Mal Jain was filed on 24-11-1970.

3. The case of the workmen as made out in their written statement is that the concerned workman Sri Rama Murthy Singh had been in continuous employment in the colliery in question as a Munshi from 1965 till he was rendered idle with effect from 17-12-1969 by Sri Chandan Mal Jain, Managing Contractor of the colliery. The workman then made an application before the Labour Enforcement Officer (Central), Bagmara dated 24-12-1969 seeking intervention and later on the workman was informed by the said officer that Sri Chandan Mal Jain was agreeable to give him employment and accordingly the workman was advised to approach him. The concerned workman approached Sri Jain several times with no effect. Thereafter, the workmen state, the Labour Enforcement Officer was approached by the concerned workman by an application dated 12-1-1970 whereupon he was advised by the said officer to raise an industrial dispute

Thereafter the concerned workman raised the industrial dispute through Mine Mazdoor Union. It is alleged that the action of the employer in refusing employment to workman Sri Rama Murthy Singh from 17-12-1969 is unlawful and unjust and that the employer had not assigned any reason for this forced unemployment. Accordingly the prayer is to decide the dispute in question in favour of the workmen and to grant the relief of reinstatement of Sri Rama Murthy Singh in his old post with full back wages.

4. According to the written statement of the employer, Sri Rama Murthy Singh was employed as a Munshi in the colliery on and from 4-1-1968 and not from the year 1965. It is stated that due to certain circumstances existing in the colliery the employer had to take the decision to retrench the concerned workman from service. He was found surplus as the purpose for which he was appointed could not be adequately served and accordingly the management served a notice on him by the letter dated 21-11-1969 to retrench him from service with effect from 30-11-1969. The employer admits that on the request of Labour Enforcement Officer (Central) the management had agreed to re-employ the concerned workman if he would turn up on 3-1-1970, but the workman concerned did not turn up on 3-1-1970 nor even upto 26-1-1970, whereupon the employer informed the Labour Enforcement Officer accordingly. The management states that the retrenchment of the concerned workman under the circumstances was justified and accordingly the reference should be decided in favour of the management.

5. The hearing of the reference was taken up in presence of both the parties on 20-10-1972 when the management examined the concerned workman Shri Rama Murthy Singh as MW-1. After cross-examination by the workmen, MW-1 was discharged. The case was then adjourned to 4-1-1973 for further hearing. On 4-1-1973 Sri P. N. Thakur, Advocate represented the employers but nobody appeared on behalf of the workmen and no step was taken on their behalf. However the case was adjourned to 11-2-1973 for further hearing. 11-2-1973 being Sunday, the case was taken up for hearing on 12-2-1973 after giving prior notice to the parties. The hearing of the case could not be taken up on 12-2-1973 and the further hearing of the case was adjourned to 15-5-1973 and both the parties were informed of the date. On 15-5-1973 neither party appeared nor any steps had been taken on their behalf. However, in the interest of justice the hearing of the case was again adjourned to 25-6-1973 after giving warning to both the parties that the case would be heard in their absence under Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes Rules (Central), if they do not turn up on the date fixed. It appears that notices were issued to both the parties informing them of the said order. On 25-6-1973 also neither party appeared nor any step was taken on their behalf. Accordingly the further hearing of the case was taken up under Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes Rules (Central).

6. From the facts aforesaid it will appear that the workmen are not interested to proceed with the reference in question any longer. The management is also satisfied after examining the concerned workman Sri Rama Murthy Singh as their witness on 30-10-1972. There is absolutely no doubt that the concerned workman is vitally interested in the result of the present reference. The evidence of the concerned workman before this Tribunal is that he has settled up the dispute with the management and he does not want to fight out the present case. In view of this evidence of the concerned workman, the concerned union does not appear to be interested to proceed with the reference.

7. In view of the facts and circumstances on record, already said above, in my opinion, it will be fair and reasonable to pass a ‘no dispute award’ in the present case and I make the award accordingly.

8. Let the award be submitted to the Central Government under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. S. TRIPATHI, Presiding Officer.

[No. 2/30/70-LR II.]

S.O. 2048 In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta on the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management

of Sripur 4, 5 and 6 Pits Colliery of Messrs. Lodna Colliery Company (1920) Limited, Post Office Kalipahari, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 28th June, 1973.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
AT CALCUTTA.**

Reference No. 63 of 1972

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of Sripur 4, 5 and 6 Pits Colliery of Messrs. Lodna Colliery Company (1920) Limited,

AND

Ibeli Workmen.

Present :

Sri S. N. Bagchi—Presiding Officer.

Appearances :

On behalf of Employers—Sri D. Basu Thakur, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen—Sri S. P. Majumdar, Bar-at-Law, with Sri Sunil Majumdar, General Secretary of Ningha Colliery Mazdoor Union.

State : West Bengal

Industry : Coal Mine

AWARD

By Order No. L/19012/88/72-LR II, dated 24-10-1972, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, referred the following dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Sripur 4, 5 and 6 Pits Colliery of Messrs. Lodna Colliery Company (1920) Limited and their workmen, to this tribunal, for adjudication, namely :—

"Whether the action of the management of Sripur 4, 5 and 6 Pits Colliery of Messrs. Lodna Colliery Company (1920) Limited, Post Office Kalipahari, District Burdwan in stopping the following workmen from work with effect from the 7th August, 1972 is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?"

1. Zamaluddin	.. Trammer
2. Sohrab Hossain	do
3. Khairuddin	do
4. Nazam	do
5. Musho Mia	do
6. Kuddus	do
7. Nabi Mia	do
8. Bino Paswan	do
9. Safdar	do
10. Muktar	do
11. Badeo Paswan	do
12. Md. Islam	do
13. Junis Mia	do
14. Ram Bris Nunia	do
15. Md. Gulam Rasul	do
16. Salim	do
17. Saraf	do
18. Rashid	do
19. Sukdeo Ram	do
20. Md. Halim	do
21. Rameshwar Jadav	do
22. Md. Hussain	do
23. Md. Aiumuddin	do
24. Bhaso Dusad	do
25. Rajek Mia	do
26. Ismail Mia	do
27. Samsul	do
28. Jubber	do"

2. Notices of the reference were served on the management and the workmen involved in this case purported to be represented by the General Secretary of Ningha Colliery Mazdoor Union. On the date of hearing the management appearing through Sri D. Basu Thakur, learned Advocate and the workmen represented by Sri S. P. Mazumdar, Counsel and Sri Sunil Majumdar, General Secretary, agreed to the case being argued on the preliminary points raised by the management.

3. For the management Sri Basu Thakur urged that the dispute as referred to for adjudication is not an industrial dispute within Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act and cannot, therefore, be entertained and adjudicated upon by this tribunal. He developed his argument on the following lines :

4. The workmen involved in this reference are 28 in number and referring to Ext. M-2, the Counterfoils of membership receipts beginning from Counter-foil No. 38 ending with counter-foil No. 63 relating to the workmen involved in this dispute, regarding payment of their membership fees for the union concerned, Mr Basu Thakur pointed out that the workmen involved in the reference case became members for the first time of the union on 2-4-1972, whereas the reference is dated 24-10-1972. The Constitution of the union which is said to be a registered trade union is Ext. M 4, Mr. Basu Thakur drew my attention to clause 4 of the Constitution of the union which amongst other things reads as : "...Subject to a contrary decision of a general meeting no member shall enjoy the rights of a member and be entitled to the benefits to which a member will be entitled under these rules or under these rules as amended later unless he (a) has been a member for not less than one year...." The Constitution of a registered trade union is to be registered at the time of registration of the trade union. In view of Sections 6 & 8 of the Trade Union Act, 1926 and the registered trade union and its members are bound by its Constitution. The workmen members became members for the first time of the union on 2-4-1972 and their membership was less than a year before the date of reference of the dispute. So, by the Constitution itself (vide Object clause 3 and Membership clause 4) the workmen cannot claim either under the Constitution itself or under Section 15(d) of the Trade Unions Act that their demand relating to the dispute referred to for adjudication could be espoused by the registered trade union of which they became members only for 6 months before the date of the reference. Before the management, the union on behalf of the workmen laid a charter of demand as in Ext. W 1, on behalf of the workmen members of the union. The first step in raising an industrial dispute as provided for in Raju's Caffe's case decided by the Madras High Court and reported in 1951 1 LLJ p. 219, in the case of Sindhu Resettlement Corporation Ltd. and Industrial Tribunal, Gujarat & Ors, 1968 1 LLJ, p. 834, decided by the Supreme Court and in the case of Fedders Lloyd Corporation Private Ltd. and Lt. Governor, Delhi & Ors, reported in F.L.R. 1970(2), p. 343, decided by the Delhi High Court, is the laying of a charter of demand either by the workmen involved in a dispute or by a union of which workmen are members espousing the cause of the workmen. By the Constitution of the present Union, the workmen members are entitled to their dispute being espoused by its union which is a registered trade union, only when the workmen members are members not less than one year. So, the union by clause 4 of the Constitution is prohibited from espousing the cause of workmen concerned in this dispute by laying a charter of demand relating to the dispute before the management and also laying such demand before the conciliatory authority since the workmen members became members for the first time only 2-4-1972 when the reference came before this tribunal on 24-10-1972. Therefore, by the provision of the Constitution of the registered trade union, neither the workmen involved in this case were entitled to get their dispute referred to for adjudication being espoused by the union of which they claim to be members, nor the union could through any of its office-bearers espouse the cause of the workmen involved in this dispute either by laying the charter of demand before the management, and thereafter, before the conciliatory authority. Accordingly, Mr. Basu Thakur argued that even if Ext. W 1 could be at all considered to be a charter of demand laid on behalf of the workmen by the General Secretary of the union, the General Secretary of the union,

had no authority by its own Constitution to lay the charter of demand before the management as well as before the conciliatory authority for and on behalf of the workmen members involved in this dispute since they had been members for less than a year at the time when the charter of demand had been laid before the management as well as before the conciliatory authority. Therefore, Mr. Basu Thakur submitted that the dispute referred to for adjudication lacked its character as a industrial dispute under Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act. In reply to this argument the learned Counsel Mr. Mazumdar submitted that such a technical defect should not weigh with the tribunal in arriving at a proper decision as to whether or not the dispute is an industrial dispute. This tribunal is bound by law and must apply the law on proved facts. The Constitution of the union and the membership of the workmen of such union clearly indicate that the trade dispute i.e. the dispute referred to for adjudication by this tribunal could not be espoused for and on behalf of the workmen by the union or any office bearer of the union. The Constitution of a Registered Trade Union as Section 6 of the Trade Union Act provides limits the power of the union to conduct a trade dispute on behalf of the union and any of its members. The Constitution of a registered trade union is to be registered along with the registration of the trade union as Sections 6 and 8 of the Trade Unions Act provide. The members of a registered trade union and the union itself a corporate body under Sec. 13 of the Trade Union Act, 1926, are bound by the terms of its Constitution. Therefore, Mr. Basu Thakur's argument based on proved facts is absolutely sound. The Union had no authority by its Constitution to espouse the cause of the workmen members involved in this case by laying the charter of demand either before the management or before the conciliatory authority in relation to the dispute referred to for adjudication. As there was no lawful service of the charter of demand by the union which had no authority to espouse the cause of the workmen involved in this dispute, the dispute referred to for adjudication loses its character as industrial dispute in view of the decisions already quoted above.

5. Mr. Basu Thakur then argued that the Constitution of the reference speaks of the stoppage of work of the workmen by the management with effect from 7th August, 1972. He submitted that neither in the Second Schedule nor in the Third Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act there is any provision relating to any matter which involves stoppage of work. He submitted that the expression "all matters other than those specified in the Third Schedule" as appearing in the 6th item of the Second Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act means and includes such matters as are within the ambit of the Industrial Disputes Act. He referred to Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act and drew my attention to the definition of Lay-off in Section 2(kk), Lock-out in Section 2(1), Retrenchment in Section 2(oo), Strike in Section 2(q). Then he drew my attention to Chapter V of the Industrial Disputes Act which provides for Strike and Lock-out and Chapter VA which provides for Lay-off and Retrenchment and Section 25FF compensation to workmen on transfer of an undertaking, Section 25FFF Closure of an undertaking, and submitted that the expression "stopping the following workmen from work with effect from 7th August, 1972" in the issue referred to for adjudication does not *per se* indicate whether it is stoppage of work of the workmen concerned due to retrenchment or due to lay-off or due to strike or due to lock-out or due to closure. He submitted that within the expression "stopping the work with effect from 7th August, 1972" distinct and different situations may arise viz., situation due to Strike or situation due to Lock or situation due to Retrenchment or situation due to Lay-off or situation due to Closure. The tribunal is not entitled to read in the expression quoted above any of those situations when the expressions itself could include any or either of such situations. The tribunal acquires jurisdiction on the constitution of the precise issue referred to for adjudication, and cannot add a jot or take a tittle out of it. He submitted that neither within the Second Schedule nor within the Third Schedule nor within any of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act there is any expression reading "stopping of work". Such an expression is as vague as vagueness could be possibly contemplated. Regarding the expression "All matters other than those specified in the Third Schedule" Mr. Basu Thakur submitted that "All matters" cannot mean matters that are beyond the scope

and content of the Industrial Disputes Act. Referring to a decision reported in 1972 I LLL, p. 231, he submitted that their Lordships of the Supreme Court pointed out that Lay-off, having been provided for by Section 25C of the Industrial Disputes Act, would come within the expression "All matters other than those specified in the Third Schedule". Referring to the specific provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, as I have already mentioned, Mr. Basu Thakur submitted that had the dispute under the issue, referred to for adjudication, used any expression, after the expression "stopping of work of the workmen with effect from 7th August, 1972", due either to lock-out, or to strike, or to retrenchment, or to lay-off, or to closure, the reference could be accepted for adjudication either on the basis that the stoppage of work was either due to strike, or due to lock-out, or due to lay-off, or due to retrenchment or due to closure, depending on the situation arising on the happening of either of such contingencies. But the tribunal could not read into the issue that the stopping of work of the workmen with effect from 7th August, 1972 was due to either of any of those situations. So, he submitted that the reference as constituted could not come within any of the items either in Second Schedule or in the Third Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act. He further pointed out that the 11th item of Third Schedule speaks of "Any other matter that may be prescribed" and submitted that there is no rule in the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 wherein anything has been prescribed as such providing for a dispute being raised for "stopping the work of workmen in an industry with effect from certain date". He, therefore, urged that the constitution of the reference could not come within the definition of Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act read with any of the items in the Second Schedule and the Third Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act. He finally urged that the dispute as referred to for adjudication being not an industrial dispute within Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, this tribunal had no jurisdiction either to entertain or to adjudicate upon the dispute. Mr. Mazumdar, the learned Counsel for the workmen could not assail the argument advanced by Mr. Basu Thakur by any cogent reason.

6. I, therefore, find that the dispute as referred to for adjudication is not an industrial dispute within Sec. 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act and as such, this tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain and adjudicate upon the dispute. The reference is, therefore, rejected.

This is my award.

Dated, June 23, 1973. S. N. BAGCHI, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-19012/88/72-LR II.]

New Delhi, the 10th July, 1973

S.O. 2049.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sripur Colliery of Messrs Lodna Colliery Company (1920) Limited, Post Office Kalipahari, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 2nd July, 1973.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 65 of 1972

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of Sripur Colliery of Messrs Lodna Colliery Company (1920) Limited,

AND

Their workmen.

Present :

Sri S. N. Bagchi—Presiding Officer.

Appearances :

On behalf of Employers—Sri D. Basu Thakur, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen—Absent.

State : West Bengal.**Industry :** Coal Mine.**AWARD**

By Order No. L/19012/89/72-LR11, dated 24-10-73, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, referred the following dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Sripur Colliery of Messrs Lodna Colliery Company (1920) Limited and their workmen, to this tribunal, for adjudication, namely :

"Whether the demand of the workmen that the workmen named in Schedule-II below should be granted permanency by the management of Sripur Colliery of Messrs Lodna Colliery Company (1920) Limited, Post Office Kalipahari, District Burdwan, is justified; and if so to what relief are the workmen entitled and from what date?"

SCHEDULE II

1. Shri Yasin Mia	U. G. Trammer
2. Shri Muslim Mia	do
3. Shri Habib Mia	do
4. Shri Kd. Hamid	do
5. Shri Ahmad Ali	do
6. Shri Majid Mia	do
7. Shri Md. Rustom	do
8. Shri Islam Mia	do
9. Shri Ainul Mia	Surface Trammer."

2. Notices of the reference were served on the management as well as on the General Secretary, Ningha Colliery Mazdoor Union. The management submitted its statement of case on 2-12-72. The management *inter-alia* submitted that the reference itself is illegal and is not maintainable under the Industrial Disputes Act. For the workmen a statement of case was signed by Sunil Mazumdar, General Secretary, Ningha Colliery Mazdoor Union and was verified by him. It was filed on 8-12-1972. It was pointed out to the General Secretary who signed and verified the statement of case that there was no endorsement on the statement of case so filed on having been sent to the management and the union's General Secretary was asked to satisfy this tribunal that the copy of the statement had been forwarded to the management. The Union's Secretary filed a rejoinder on 11-1-1973 signed and verified by him. He also filed an application 10-4-1973 for working the authority of the Coal-mines as party to this proceeding. He was asked to appear and file a proper letter of authority. He was further asked to move the petition on 29-5-73. On 29-5-73 it was desolved that the Colliery had vested under Ordinance No. 1 of 1973 in the Central Government, and that the Statutory Custodian of the Central Government of such mine has already appeared on 30-4-73 through Sri D. Basu Thakur, Advocate. So, the Union of India through the Secretary of Mines and Metals appearing through the Custodian was already made a party. The General Secretary who filed the application for making the Custodian a party to the proceeding also filed a rejoinder to the written statement of the management which I have already mentioned. He was asked to file a proper letter of authority entitling him to represent the workmen concerned in this proceeding. He was directed to inform the workmen concerned that the workmen should make and subscribe a letter of authority as required under Rule 36 Form F of the Central rules authorising Sunil Mazumdar, General Secretary of the Union of which the workmen are supposed to be members to represent the workmen in this proceeding as no such letter of authority had been filed by the General Secretary of the union upto 29-5-1973. The case was fixed on 7-6-1973 for hearing.

3. On 6-6-73 a written statement signed and verified by Sri Sunil Mazumdar with a letter of authority, made and subscribed by few of the workmen involved in this reference, authorising Sri S. P. Mazumdar, Bar-at-Law and Sri Sunil Mazumdar, General Secretary, Ningha Colliery Mazdoor Union to represent the workmen involved in this case, was filed. The rejoinder that was filed had already been rejected by the order dated 29-5-1973 in presence of Sri Sunil Mazumdar. No further rejoinder was filed thereafter. On

7-6-1973 the tribunal being busy with the hearing of another case the hearing of the case was adjourned to 13-6-73. On 13-6-73 the case was taken up for hearing. The other reference case No. 63 of 1972 in which the management and the workmen parties are of the same colliery was heard on 13-6-73. The hearing of the other case was finished before the recess. The management appeared through Sri. D. Basu Thakur, Advocate, while the workmen involved in this reference case appeared through the learned Counsel Sri Mazumdar as well as through the General Secretary Sunil Mazumdar who were authorised to represent the workmen by the letter of authority made and subscribed by the workmen on 4th June, 1973 and filed in this reference case on 6th June, 1973. On 13-6-73 after the other case was completely heard, I got up for the recess. Before I got up for the recess the learned Counsel Sri Mazumdar for the workmen wanted an adjournment of the case on the ground that he would consult his senior. Mr. Basu Thakur on behalf of the management opposed the prayer on the ground that this matter is pending for a long time and the question involved in this case is the same as that in Reference Case No. 63 of 1972. So, I asked the learned Counsel to appear and to argue the case on the preliminary points at 3 p.m. At 3 p.m. when I resumed my sitting the learned Counsel was absent and the General Secretary of the union who got authority to represent the workmen submitted that the learned Counsel had got a telephonic call about his sister's illness who had been removed to the hospital, and left. He assured that the learned Counsel would appear in this case on 14-6-73 and would argue the case. I adjourned the case for hearing on 14-6-73. On 14-6-73 two applications for adjournment of this reference case and the other reference case, which had been completely heard, came from Sri Sunil Mazumdar. Those applications show that the Counsel appointed by the workmen in both the cases was unable to appear as some member of his family had been seriously ill and that six week's adjournment was to be given in both the cases for enabling the workmen to engage another Counsel. On 14-6-73 when this case was called for hearing, since the other case had been fully argued before recess on 13-6-73, neither the counsel Sri Mazumdar nor Sri Sunil Mazumdar could be found in the court room. Sri Sunil Mazumdar assured in this case on 13-6-73 that the Counsel would appear on 14-6-73 and would argue the case. So, the case was adjourned for argument on preliminary points to 14-6-73. The management appeared through Mr. D. Basu Thakur, Advocate who strongly objected the manner in which the two applications for adjournment came to this Court and the discourtesy shown by Sunil Mazumdar by sending two such applications to this tribunal while keeping himself absent from the tribunal though he was authorised by the workmen to represent the workmen involved in this case. Considering the situation, I refused to adjourn this case and the management through Mr. D. Basu Thakur argued the case on preliminary points.

4. First of all, I should record that neither the statement of case nor the rejoinder nor the fresh statement of case had been signed by any of the workmen involved in this case nor any of the workmen involved in this case verified any of such statements. No document filed in this case had been made, and subscribed, and verified by the workmen or some of them involved in this case. In view of Rule 10B(1) of the Central Rules and Rule 29 thereof, no representative of any party to any proceeding can act in any manner otherwise than what is provided for by those rules. If any representative of any of the parties to the dispute acts contrary to these rules his act shall not bind the party concerned. Sunil Mazumdar, General Secretary of the union who signed all the documents and verified the statement of case purported to be for the workmen as well as the rejoinder had no right to do so in view of Rule 10B(1) and Rule 29 of the Central Rules. Therefore, I could not consider the two statements of case purported to be the rejoinder filed by Sri Sunil Mazumdar, General Secretary. As I have already observed, the case was heard *ex-parte* on preliminary points.

5. Mr. D. Basu Thakur on arguing the preliminary points formulated his arguments on the following heads :

- (a) The dispute referred to for adjudication was not espoused lawfully by the union, and as such not an industrial dispute.

- (b) As constituted, the dispute i.e. the issue referred to for adjudication does not fall either within Schedule II or Schedule III of the Industrial Disputes Act and as such is not an industrial dispute which can be entertained and adjudicated upon by this tribunal.
- (c) There is no resolution by the Executive Committee of the Union espousing the cause of the workmen concerned in this dispute;
- (d) The Register of membership show that it is not a dependable and genuine document. Internal evidence in the register and membership foils show that the workmen involved in this reference became members of the union and continued to be so for a period less than the qualified period as enjoined by the union's Constitution entitling them to get the benefit of their case being espoused by the union concerned;
- (e) There was no demand relating to the dispute referred to for adjudication before the authority of the management as required by law and as such the dispute is not an industrial dispute.

Mr. Basu Thakur relied on the documentary evidence appearing in the documents filed by the union. He also relied on certain documentary evidence admitted in Reference Case No. 63 of 1972 in which the management and the Colliery are the same but the workmen, employed by the same management are different persons, purported to be represented by the same union Ningha Colliery Mazdoor Union i.e. the union mentioned in this reference case as well as in Reference Case No. 63 of 1972.

6. All points taken together are considered:

Mr. Basu Thakur relied on the Constitution filed by the Union representing the workmen in case No. 63 of 1972 and in this case and marked exhibit in both the cases. Paragraph 4 of the Constitution, Ext. M2 in this case says that, "Workers . . . employed in Messrs Lodna Colliery Co. Ltd., P. O. Kalipahari, Dt. Burdwan, shall be eligible for admission as ordinary members of the Union. An ordinary member shall pay subscription at 0.25 P. per month payable immediately on enrolment and thereafter by the end of the month . . . Subject to a contrary decision of a general meeting, no member shall enjoy the rights of a member and be entitled to the benefits to which a member will be entitled under these rules or under these rules as amended later, unless he (a) has been a member for not less than one year and (b) has paid all his dues to the Union". Clause 5 says, "The Union shall maintain a register of members, and name, age, address, occupation and such other particulars as may be considered necessary concerning each member . . .". The workmen involved in this case are nine. The reference is dated 24-10-1972. The workmen involved in the reference are:

(1) Yasin Mia	Dt.	2-5-72	Subscription	Rs.5/-	(vide
(2) Muslim Mia	do	do	do	do	counter-
(3) Habib Mia	do	do	do	do	Foils of
(4) Md. Hamid	do	do	do	do	member-
(5) Ahmad Ali	do	do	do	do	ship re-
(6) Majid Mia	do	do	do	do	ceipt
(7) Md. Rustom	do	do	do	do	book).
(8) Islam Mia	do	do	do	do	
(9) Ainul Mia	do	do	do	do	

(Vide Ext. M3 in Reference Case No. 63 of 1972—the counterfoils of membership receipts). The above will show that annual subscription was realised at Rs. 5 contrary to clause 4 of the Constitution and those workmen became members of the union only on 2-5-72 while the dispute referred to for adjudication is dated 24-10-72. Therefore, in view of clause 4 of the Constitution of the union those workmen at the time when the dispute was referred to for adjudication had not been members for more than five months and less than one year, and were not entitled to any benefit to which a member will be entitled under the rules of the Constitution. The object of the union is in clause 3 of which sub-clause (b) says "conduct a trade dispute on behalf of a member". So, on behalf of the workmen members of the union, the union was not authorised

by the Constitution to conduct a trade dispute on behalf of the workmen involved in this case, since those workmen had not been members for the qualifying period i.e. for not less than one year. They had been members of the union only for five months before the case came on reference to this tribunal. The membership register is Ext. M1 in Reference Case No. 63 of 1972 was relied upon also by Mr. Basu Thakur. It is for the year 1972 of Ningha Colliery Mazdoor Union, Registration No. 7729. In clause 5 of the Constitution of the Union, the union shall maintain a register of members, name age, address, occupation and other particulars. In the register there is the Sl. No. in column 1, name in column 2, Colliery Sripur Seam, Designation Loader. There is no column relation to age and address. So, the register is not maintained according to the specific terms of the Constitution of the union. In neither of the cases i.e. Reference No. 63 and Reference No. 65 of 1972, the union representing the workmen filed by resolution of the Executive Committee of the Union authorising any of its office bearers to espouse the cause of the workmen involved in this reference case. The letter of demand relating to the dispute is Ext. M3 in his reference case. The letter reads as follows:

"No. S/2/106

Dated 16-8-1972

The Manager,
Sripur Colliery,
P.O. Kalipahari.

Sub: Permanency of service of Sri Yasin Mia, Muslim Mia, Habib Mia, Md. Hamid, Ahmed Ali, Majid Mia, Md. Rustom, Islam Mia, U/G Trammer & Ainul Mia, S/Trammer of your Sripur Colliery.

Dear Sir,

The workmen under subject have been working in your colliery since 1966 regularly as Trammers but they are never paid any quarterly bonus, holiday wages, P.S. Bonus and earn leave wages, train fare, etc.

They are permanent workers in every respects but for demanding their statutory benefits, they are not given full 6 days work for the last one week and new persons are being employed stopping their works.

You are requested to look into their grievances and see that their benefits are given and they are treated as permanent workmen.

Thanking you,

Copy to the Chief Mining Engineer,
Sripur Gr. of collieries.

Yours faithfully,

Sd. Sunil Majumdar, General Secretary
16/8/72"

In paragraph 2 of the letter it is stated that the workmen are permanent workers in every respects but for demand of their statutory benefits they are not given full 6 days work for the last one week and new persons are being employed stopping their work. Next paragraph reads, "You are requested to look into their grievances and see that their benefits are given and they are treated as permanent workmen". Mr. Basu Thakur drew my attention to the Failure report submitted by the Conciliation Officer to the appropriate Government attached to the order of reference. There the union's case reads as follows: "The Union's case is contained in its representation dated 28-8-72. During the course of conciliation meeting and in reply to the comments of the management the Union representative stated that the workmen have not been stopped from work w.e.f. 7-8-72 as alleged by the management. They are still working in their respective jobs. The Union produced 4 documents to support that they are treated as temporary workers and have fulfilled the conditions of service to become permanent. The Union further stated that the management did not produce records as asked for to prove their contention that the workmen involved in the dispute were engaged

as badlies. The Union demanded that the workmen concerned should be made permanent in their respective jobs forthwith". The union representative's statement that the workmen had not been stopped from doing work with effect from 7-8-72 as alleged by the management is contradicted by the second paragraph of the so called letter of demand, Ext. M3. Mr. Basu Thakur submitted that for the workmen involved in this dispute the union had no authority to conduct any trade dispute on behalf of the workmen in view of the conditions in the rules of the Constitution of the union as in paragraph 4, already quoted. He further submitted that as there was no resolution of the union concerned authorising any of its office bearers to espouse the cause of the workmen involved in this case and as the workmen themselves being not members of the union for not less than a year before the reference was referred to for adjudication by this tribunal, the union had no authority under its Constitution to espouse the cause of the workmen members of such union either before the management or before the conciliatory authority in view of the specific bar in Clause 4(a) of the Constitution of the union itself. So, the alleged demand as in Ext. M3, and the espousing of the cause of the workmen involved in this case by the General Secretary of Union had been contrary to law. The Union in view of Section 6 of the Trade Union Act, 1926 being a registered trade, is bound by its own Constitution. By the Constitution of the union, the workmen concerned being not members of the union for the qualifying period, could not claim the benefit of their case being espoused as a trade dispute by the union concerned and could not also claim by the very Constitution of the union itself that the General Secretary of the union would lawfully espouse the cause of the workmen concerned in this dispute either before the management of the colliery or before the conciliatory authority. So Mr. Basu Thakur submitted that at the instance of the General Secretary of the union the cause of the workmen could neither be espoused by the union for and on behalf of the workmen concerned in this dispute either before the management or before the conciliatory authority in view of the specific terms in clause 4 of the union Constitution. Accordingly, the demand allegedly made by the union on 16-8-72, Ext. M3, on behalf of the workmen concerned in this dispute before the management and before the conciliatory authority on 28-8-72 was hit by the specific prohibition in clause 4 of the Constitution of the union itself. Moreover, there is no authority by the resolution of the Executive Committee of the union for the General Secretary of the union to espouse the cause of the workmen involved in this dispute either before the management or before the conciliatory authority. So, Mr. Basu Thakur concluded that the dispute referred to by the Government for adjudication as constituted in the order of reference was not an industrial dispute. Under the Trade Union Act Section 15(d) a registered trade union can conduct a trade dispute on behalf of the union or any members of such union. But this right is controlled and conditioned by the Constitution of the union itself. Ext. M2. The Constitution of the union would not permit the union to conduct any trade dispute on behalf of its members unless a member or members had been members of the union for not less than one year. Ext. M3 in the Reference Case No. 63 of 1972 on which Mr. Basu Thakur relied relating to the workmen involved in this case would show that they became members of the union only on 2-5-72 that means five months before the dispute was referred to for adjudication by this tribunal. On behalf of these workmen members involved in this case, the union had no authority by its own Constitution to espouse the cause of such workmen members relating to the demand in the issue referred to for adjudication by this tribunal. Therefore, by espousing the cause relating to the demand in the issue referred to for adjudication by this tribunal on behalf of the workman involved in this reference the General Secretary of the union acted contrary to its Constitution as well as Section 15(d) of the Trade Union Act, 1926. Accordingly, the dispute referred to for adjudication, on being espoused for the workmen involved in this case by the General Secretary of the union did not acquire under the law the character of an industrial dispute under Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Moreover there is no resolution of the Executive Committee of the union authorising the General Secretary of the union to espouse the cause of the workmen members involved in this case either before the management or before the conciliatory authority. In support of his contention for the absence of any resolution of the Executive Committee of the union authorising the General Secretary of the union to espouse the cause of the workmen involved in this case Mr. Basu Thakur relied on a decision of the Division Bench of the Mysore High Court in the case of Bangalore Woollen, Cotton and Silk Mills Company Ltd., and their

workmen, reported in 1968 1 LLJ p. 514 where however there was the supporting resolution of the Executive Committee authorising its office bearers to espouse the cause of the workmen involved in the said dispute whereas there is no such resolution by the Executive Committee of the present union authorising its General Secretary Sri Sunil Mazumdar to espouse the cause of the workmen involved in this reference. As the demand before the management and the demand before the conciliatory authority had been made by the General Secretary of the union, unsupported by any resolution of the Executive Committee of the union authorising him to do so on behalf of the workmen concerned and in violation of the Constitution of the union itself so far as it relates to the workmen members involved in this case concerning their right to get their demand in the issue referred to for adjudication by this tribunal, being espoused by the union of which they claim to be members, before the management as well as before the conciliatory authority the dispute in the issue referred to for adjudication by this tribunal had not, therefore, acquired the character of an industrial dispute within Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act. As the demand before the management and the conciliatory authority in the issue referred to for adjudication had not been lawfully made by the General Secretary of the union, claiming to espouse the cause of the workmen members involved in this case, the dispute referred to for adjudication fell within the principles laid down in the decisions of Raju's Calfee Coimbatore and Others vs. Industrial Tribunal Coimbatore and another, 1951 1 LLJ, p. 219, Sadhu Resettlement Corporation Ltd., and Industrial Tribunal, Gujarat & Ors., 1968 1 LLJ, p. 834 and Fedders Lloyed Corporation Private Ltd. and Lt. Governor, Delhi & Ors., 1970(20), p. 343 respectively by the Madras High Court, Supreme Court and the Delhi High Court. Considering these legal aspects on facts proved in this reference, I hold that the dispute referred to for adjudication did not acquire the character of an industrial dispute within Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

7. Schedule Two of the Industrial Disputes Act contains six items. It does not include any matter relating to permanency of a workman. Item 6 in Second Schedule reads as "All matters other than those specified in the Third Schedule". All matters in item 6 of Second Schedule must be those matters that are within the ambit of the Industrial Disputes Act' Explaining 'all matters other than those specified in the Third Schedule' in the case reported in 1972 1 LLJ, p. 231, their Lordships of the Supreme Court held that lay-off being a matter covered by Section 25C of the Industrial Disputes Act comes within the said clause. As regards permanency of a workman, there is no provision in the Industrial Disputes Act. Third Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act contains 11 items. Item 11 speak of "any other matter that may be prescribed". There is no rule prescribed for permanency of a workman in his post in the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957. So, the dispute relating to the permanency of the workmen involved in this reference pre-supposed that the workmen are not permanent workmen. Whether the workmen would be made permanent or not is a question to be decided by the management on consideration of various circumstances. Neither Schedule II nor the Third Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act contains any item relating to the permanency of a workman. So, Mr. Basu Thakur submitted that from this aspect also the dispute referred to for adjudication is not an industrial dispute.

8. Considering all these aspects, I hold that the dispute referred to for adjudication by this tribunal is not in law an industrial dispute under Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, and as such this tribunal has no jurisdiction either to entertain or to adjudicate upon the dispute. The reference is, therefore, rejected on the preliminary points as argued by Mr. Basu Thakur, Advocate for the management.

This is my award.

Dated June 22, 1973.

S. N. BAGCHI, Presiding Officer
[No. L-19012/89/72-LR II.]

New Delhi, the 10th July, 1973

S.O. 2050.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of

Lower Kenda Colliery (The Khas Kenda Colliery (Private) Limited, Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 28th June, 1973.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 66 of 1972

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of Lower Kenda Colliery (The Khas Kenda Colliery Private Limited)

AND

Their Workmen.

Present :

Sri S. N. Bagchi—Presiding Officer.

Appearances :

On behalf of Employers—Sri Monoj Kr. Mukherjee, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen—Sri Sunil Sen, Organising Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Sabha (AITUC).

State: West Bengal

Industry: Coal Mine

AWARD

By Order No. L/19012/92/72-IRII dated 14th November 1972, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, referred the following industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Lower Kenda Colliery (The Khas Kenda Colliery Private Limited) and their workmen, to this tribunal, for adjudication, namely:—

"Whether the management of Lower Kenda Colliery (The Khas Kenda Colliery Private Limited) Post Office Kajoragram District Burdwan are justified in stopping the work of Shri Ram Subhag Misra, Night Guard, with effect from the 4th August, 1972? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. After the reference was registered notices were issued on the management and on the Organising Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, P.O. Asansol, District Burdwan, neither the management nor the workmen filed any statement of case. On 30-4-73 the learned Advocate Mr. Monoj Kumar Mukherjee appeared for the management i.e. the Coal Mines Authority and none appeared for the workman, 8th June, 1973 was fixed for hearing of the case. On that date a letter of authority signed by the workmen in favour of Sri Sunil Sen, Organising Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, AITUC, Asansol, was made and filed for representing the workman in this proceeding. The Custodian authorised the learned Advocate Mr. Monoj Kumar Mukherjee to represent the management now vested in the Central Government administered by the Coal Mines Authority. A joint petition of compromise was filed by Sri Sunil Sen for the workman and Sri Monoj Kumar Mukherjee Advocate for the management. The parties prayed that the compromise be recorded and the terms of the petition be made a part of the award. Heard the learned Advocate for the management as well as the representative of the workman Sri Sunil Sen, Organising Secretary of Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, Registered No. 3449

3. I am not in a position to record the compromise since in my view the dispute referred to for adjudication is not an industrial dispute. In Reference Case No 103 of 1971 the Register of trade unions maintained by the Registrar of Trade Unions, West Bengal was called for by the management and was marked Ext. M. 14 (vide award published). There it was found that Colliery Mazdoor Sabha was registered on 15-7-55 bearing Sl. No. 3449. The Register further showed that the said union's registered head office is located at Jamuria, P. O. Jamuria District Burdwan. It was found in that reference case (vide award published) that there is no registered trade union bearing registration Sl. No. 3449 with

its registered head office either at Raniganj or at Asansol with the name Colliery Mazdoor Sabha. Up to the date of the award in that reference case i.e. December, 1972, as was found in that award, a registered trade union bearing Sl. No. 3449 with its registered head office at Jamuria, P. O. Jamuria, District Burdwan exists by the name of Colliery Mazdoor Sabha. It was further found in that reference case (vide award published) that the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha bearing Sl. No. 3449 was not registered as a trade union having its head office at any place other than at Jamuria. In that reference case a trade union bearing the name Colliery Mazdoor Sabha (CITU) with registration No. 3449 claimed to have its office at Raniganj and Asansol. That trade union of the name Colliery Mazdoor Sabha affiliated to CITU bearing Sl. No. 3449 was found to be not identical with the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha bearing Sl. No. 3449 having its registered head office at Jamuria P.O. Jamuria, District Burdwan. The Register of Trade Unions, Ext. M14, proved in that reference case is maintained under Sec. 8 of the Trade Unions Act in which any change of the head office of any registered trade union has to be recorded by the Registrar of trade union in the manner discussed in that award. That is a statutory register to be maintained under the provisions of Trade Union law and as such, is a public document, entries wherein are conclusive unless contrary is proved by any party controverting the same. I observed in that reference case vide award: "Looking into the register of trade unions, Ext. M14, I hold that it has been maintained upto date according to law by the Registrar of trade unions. Therefore, there is no registered trade union of the name Colliery Mazdoor Sabha bearing Regd. Sl. No. 3449 having its any office, not to speak of its head office, either at Asansol or at Raniganj. The Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, bearing Regd. Sl. No. 3449 having its office at Asansol and Raniganj, Dist. Burdwan is not, therefore, a registered trade union under Section 8 of the Trade Unions Act read with Section 13 of that Act. Moreover, as there cannot be in law two organisations of registered Trade Unions bearing the same name and the same registration serial number, one of such organisations must be a spurious one, having no legal existence as a registered trade union under Trade Unions Act". I am, therefore, bound by what I have already held in reference case No. 103 of 1971, the award of which was published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Sec. 3(ii), p.248, dated 20-1-1973. In this proceeding Sri Sunil Sen who signed the compromise petition on behalf of the workman claimed to be the Organising Secretary of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, registration No. 3449 having its head office at G. T. Road, Asansol. As I have found in the reference case No. 103 of 1971, I must hold that there is only one registered trade union, bearing the name Colliery Mazdoor Sabha with its registration Sl. No. 3449 and its registered head office is at Jamuria, P.O. Jamuria, District Burdwan. So, the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha bearing registration No. 3449, affiliated to AITUC having its registered head office at G. T. Road, Asansol, cannot be, in view of my award in reference case No. 103 of 1971, a duly registered trade union under the Trade Union Act of 1926.

4. Sri Sunil Sen submitted that the change of the registered head office of Colliery Mazdoor Sabha had been notified to the register of trade unions. But in reference case No. 103 of 1971 (vide award) this tribunal found on examining the register of trade unions maintained by the Registrar of Trade Unions, West Bengal (Ext. M. 14 in that reference case) that upto 19th December, 1972 i.e. the date of the award, in that reference case, in the register of trade unions, Ext. M14, there was no note of any change of address of the registered head office of the trade union, named Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, having such office at Jamuria, P.O. Jamuria, District Burdwan. I have found in that reference case that the register of trade unions is a public document maintained under the Trade Unions Act of 1926 by the Registrar of Trade Unions. Unless the entries in that register are proved to be incorrect by any one who controverts the correctness of the entries, this tribunal is bound to accept the entries in the register of trade unions maintained by the Registrar of Trade Unions, West Bengal. So, upto December, 1972 the Register of trade unions exhibited in reference case No. 103 of 1971, Ext. M 14, in that case, showed that there is only one registered trade union of the name Colliery Mazdoor Sabha bearing Sl. No. 3449 having its registered head office at no place other than at Jamuria, P.O. Jamuria, District Burdwan. So, Colliery Mazdoor Sabha bearing Sl. No. 3449 (AITUC affiliated) having its assumed registered head office at G. T. Road,

New Delhi, the 12th July, 1973

Asansol, is not identical with the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, bearing registration Sl. No. 3449, having its registered trade office in existence upto December, 1972 at Jamuria, P.O. Jamuria, District Burdwan, in view of the entries appearing in Ext. M14, the register of trade unions maintained by the Registrar of Trade Unions, West Bengal. Therefore, the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, AITUC registration Sl. No. 3449 having its assumed registered head office at G. T. Road, P.O. Asansol, District Burdwan cannot claim under the Trade Union law to be a duly registered trade union. The Organising Secretary Sri Sunil Sen of that trade union cannot claim to be an office bearer of such a trade union which under the law is not a registered trade union. It is not the case that Sri Sunil Sen, Organising Secretary of Colliery Mazdoor Sabha is an office bearer of an unregistered trade union. So, if Colliery Mazdoor Sabha bearing Sl. No. 3449 (AITUC) claims to have its registered head office at G. T. Road, Asansol when the entries in Ext. M14 the register of registered trade unions in West Bengal maintained by the Registrar of Trade Unions, West Bengal, show that Colliery Mazdoor Sabha bearing Sl. No. 3449 has its registered head office at Jamuria, P.O. Jamuria, District Burdwan, the persons who claim to be the office bearers of Colliery Mazdoor Sabha bearing Sl. No. 3449 having its assumed registered head office at G. T. Road, Asansol must have committed fraud upon the Trade Union Act as well as upon the Industrial Disputes Act. Sri Sunil Sen cannot claim to be the Organising Secretary of a registered trade union bearing Sl. No. 3449 having its registered Head Office at G. T. Road, Asansol. His representation before the conciliatory authority that the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha (AITUC), G. T. Road, Asansol was a registered trade union under the Trade Unions Act was clearly a fraud upon the Trade Union Act. His acceptance of the letter of authority made and subscribed by the workman in this proceeding as Organising Secretary of Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, a registered trade union bearing Sl. No. 3449 having its head office at G. T. Road, Asansol, is also a fraudulent representation made by him in his proceeding, and, as such is a fraud upon Section 36(1)(a) of the Industrial Disputes Act read with Rule 36 Form F of the Central rules thereof. At the instance of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha bearing Sl. No. 3449 claiming to have its registered head office at G. T. Road, Asansol (vide its common seal on the letter of authority), the individual dispute of the workman was seemingly espoused by such union and such union took up the dispute before the conciliatory authority. The conciliatory authority was made to believe that the workman's demand under the issue referred to for adjudication had been espoused by a registered trade union when, however, the trade union in question was not, according to law, a registered trade union. So, the conciliation proceedings were vitiated by fraud of those who claimed to be the office bearers of such a trade union. This fraud affected the appropriate Government's decision to refer the dispute before this tribunal. Before this tribunal this fraud of the so called union affected the proceedings in this reference when Sri Sunil Sen as Organising Secretary of the Union accepted the letter of authority made and subscribed by the workman concerned purporting to represent the workman in this proceeding as an office bearer of a registered trade union of which the workman is supposed to be a member, as required by Sec. 36(1)(a) of the Industrial Disputes Act read with Rule 36 Form F of the Central rules. Here again the action of Sri Sunil Sen has been fraudulent and such fraud has affected this proceeding. Fraud vitiates everything. Therefore, the dispute as referred to for adjudication has been tainted with fraud at the instance of those who claimed to be the office bearers of a registered trade union which is not in fact and in law a registered trade union. Accordingly, I cannot entertain and adjudicate upon the dispute as referred to for adjudication as an "industrial dispute" under the law. So, I refuse to record the compromise.

5. I, therefore, hold that this tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain and to adjudicate upon the dispute which has been tainted with fraud from its very inception and has lost its legal basis for an industrial dispute. I, therefore, reject the reference.

This is my award.

Dated, 16th June, 1973 S. N. BAGCHI, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-19012/92/72-LR II.]

S.O. 2051.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1), Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Chief Agent, Messrs Oriental Coal Company Limited, Post Office Bhowra, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th July, 1973.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

in the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 92 of 1971

Parties:

Employers in relation to the Chief Agent, Messrs Oriental Coal Company Limited, Post Office, Bhowra District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen

Present:

Mr. Justice D. D. Seth (Retd.), Presiding Officer.

Appearances:

For the Old Employers—none.

For the Custodian General—Shri D. Narasingh, Advocate.

For the Bharat Coking Coal Ltd.—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri S. Das Gupta, Advocate.

State : Bihar

Industry : Coal

AWARD

This is a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and arises out of an order passed by the Central Government being order No. L/2012/173/71-LRII dated the 16th December, 1971 in respect of an industrial dispute between the parties mentioned above. The subject matter of the dispute has been specified in the schedule to the said order which runs as follows:—

"Whether the action of the management of Bhowra (N), Bhowra (S), Amlabad, Pootkee, Kankanee, Badjna and Madhuband Collieries of Messrs Oriental Coal Company Limited, Central Office Bhowra, Post Office Bhowra, District Dhanbad in refusing sick leave wages for the 1st day of sickness to the concerned workmen vide letter No. Ad/6/6718-40, dated the 26th August, 1970 is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

2. The reference was received in the office of the Tribunal on 21-12-1971 when usual notices were issued. Since the management of the colliery had been taken over by the Central Government a notice was also issued to the Custodian General. On 23-3-1972 an application was filed on behalf of the Bharat Coking Coal Limited that it had no objection to being added as a party to the reference. Accordingly, Bharat Coking Coal Limited was added as a party and time was allowed to file a written statement. Bharat Coking Coal Limited filed its written statement on 1-5-1972. On 14-5-1973 Shri D. Narasingh, Advocate appeared for the Custodian General and filed an application that the Custodian General had no objection to be impleaded as a party in the reference and prayed for a month's time for filing written statement. No written statements, oral or documentary evidence were filed by the old management and the workmen. Time prayed for was allowed. The reference was fixed for hearing on 30-6-1973 when Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate appeared for the Bharat Coking Coal

Limited. Shri D. Narsingh, Advocate appeared for the Custodian General and Shri S. Das Gupta, Advocate appeared for the workmen. No one appeared for the old management. On 30-6-1973 Shri Das Gupta, appearing for the workmen, filed an application stating that after the collieries mentioned in the schedule of the reference were taken over by the Central Government, all workmen are being paid sick leave from the first day of their sickness and, as such, as dispute mentioned in the schedule of the order of reference does no more persists. Shri Das Gupta therefore prayed that no dispute award be passed by the Tribunal. To this application Shri D. Narsingh appearing for the Custodian General and Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate appearing for the Bharat Coking Coal Limited have no objection.

3. Since it has been stated by the learned Advocate for the workmen that after the collieries had been taken over by the Central Government all workmen are being paid sick leave from the first day of their sickness and since it has been prayed that, under the circumstances, a no dispute award be passed and since the learned Counsel appearing for the Bharat Coking Coal Limited and the Custodian General have no objection to a no dispute award being passed/I accept the application filed by Shri S. Das Gupta. Accordingly as prayed for by the learned Advocate for the workmen, I pass a no dispute award and since a no dispute award is being passed the workmen are not entitled to any relief.

4. Let a copy of this award be forwarded to the Central Government under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for information.

D. D. SETH, Presiding Officer.
[No. 2012/173/71-LR II]

प्रावेश

नई दिल्ली, 13 जुलाई, 1973

क्र० आ० 2052—यत् भारत का खाद्य निगम, नई दिल्ली में सञ्चालित निर्यातको और उनके कर्मकारों, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व परिवहन और डाक कर्मकार संघ, मद्रास करता है, के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है।

और यत् उक्त निर्यातको और कर्मकारों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (1) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में एक लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को उभयों के निरिच्छित व्यक्ति द्वारा माध्यस्थता के लिए निर्दिष्ट करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त माध्यस्थता करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार को भेजी गई है।

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त माध्यस्थता करार को, जो उसे 25 जून, 1973 को मिला था प्रकाशित करती है।

करार

विवादों को माध्यस्थता के लिये स्वेच्छा से निर्दिष्ट करने के लिये करार

(औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन)

पक्षकारों का नाम

निर्यातक का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाला भारत का खाद्य निगम जिसका प्रतिनिधित्व ज्येष्ठ क्षेत्रीय प्रबन्धक, भारत का खाद्य निगम, मद्रास करता है।

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाला श्री एम० सी० सी० एम्बोनी, फिल्डे अध्यक्ष, परिवहन और डाक कर्मकार संघ, मद्रास।

यत् एमार्ग डिपो में भारत का खाद्य निगम के स्थोरा उठाने वाले कार्यकारो ने 20 फरवरी, 1973 को हड़ताल की;

और यत् क्षेत्रीय श्रम-प्राप्त, मद्रास द्वारा की गई गुप्त कार्यवाहियां के दौरान पक्षकारों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम की धारा 12(3) के

अधीन हुए समझौते के अनुसार यह करार किया था कि परिवहन और डाक कर्मकार संघ, मद्रास को उनके तारीख 23-2-1973 और 2-3-1973 वाले पत्रों में दी गई मांगों पर पक्षकारों के बीच नियोजक के मुख्य कार्यालय में विचार-विमर्श किया जाना चाहिए;

और यत् पूर्वोक्त विचार-विमर्श के पश्चात् पक्षकारों के बीच उक्त समझौते के अनुसार, कोई समझौता नहीं हो सका,

अब पक्षकारों के बीच यह करार किया गया है कि निम्नलिखित विवादग्रस्त निरिच्छित विषयों को, गुणागुण के आधार पर पचाट और किन्हीं अन्य निर्देशों के लिए श्री के० श्रीनिवासन, मेधा निवृत्त व्यायाधीन, मद्रास उच्च न्यायालय के माध्यस्थता के लिए निर्दिष्ट किया जाए।

1. निरिच्छित विवादग्रस्त विषय :

- (i) क्या 18 दिन की वर्तमान न्यूनतम गारंटी में कोई वृद्धि व्याप्य है ? यदि हां, तो क्या इसे 21 दिन तक बढ़ाया जाना चाहिए ? और किस तारीख से ?
- (ii) क्या वर्तमान मातानुपाती दर स्कीम को प्रोत्साहन मातानुपाती दर स्कीम के रूप में पुनरीक्षित किया जाना चाहिए ? यदि हां, तो स्कीम का ढंग तथा वह तारीख जिससे इसे प्रभावी किया जाना चाहिए, उपरिष्ठित किया जाये।

(टिप्पण:—नियोजक, कर्मकारों के लिए एक प्रोत्साहन मातानुपाती दर स्कीम तैयार करने के लिए सहमत हो गया है।)

- (iii) क्या किंगी मिस्त्री को, जब कि वह मातानुपाती दर पर हो, अनुज्ञेय अन्तरीय वेतन की सगणना करने का वर्तमान ढंग तारीख 9-2-1972 के करार के अनुसार ठीक रूप से अपनाया जा रहा है ? यदि नहीं तो, उसकी सगणना किस रीति से की जानी चाहिये और किस तारीख से ?

- (iv) क्या ब्रिटरिंग बिकरसा संबंधी सुविधाएं कर्मकारों के कुटुम्बों को भी दी जायें और यदि हां, तो किस तारीख से ?

(टिप्पण: निर्यातक मिद्वान रूप में यह सुविधा देने के लिए सहमत हो गया है।)

- (v) क्या ग्रंथदायी भविष्य निधि की बटौती के प्रयोजन के लिए हाजिरी भत्ता, आशाभंग भजदूरी और नगर प्रतिकर भत्ता किसी कर्मकार की भजदूरी में जोड़ा जा सकता है ?

- (vi) क्या मद्रास डाक श्रम कोट द्वारा बनाई गई निधि के आधार पर श्रम कल्याण निधि गठित की जाए या उसे श्रम विभाग के ज्ञापन संख्या एम० डब्ल्यू० 18(1)/46, तारीख 16 दिसम्बर 1946 के अनुसार भारत सरकार द्वारा केन्द्रीय औद्योगिक उपग्रहों के लिए तैयार की गई आदर्श स्कीम के अनुसार या अन्य किसी आधार पर गठित किया जाना चाहिए और यदि हां, तो किस तारीख से ?

- (vii) गृह भाटक भत्ता और नागर प्रतिकर भत्ता मासिक आधार पर सभी कर्मकारों को दिया जा रहा है, तो क्या किसी कर्मकार द्वारा त्योहारी अवकाश दिनों में किए गए काम के लिए भजदूरी की सगणना करने समय इन भत्तों को पुनः जोड़ा जाए ?

- (viii) क्या इगमोर डिपो के 45 अस्थायी कर्मकारों, जिनमें 3 मिस्त्री सम्मिलित हैं, के वेतन का नियमन 1-1-1969 से, न कि 1-8-1971 से, प्रभावी होना चाहिए ?

- (ix) क्या इगमोर डिपो के कर्मकारों को बढ़िया दी जानी है ?

- (x) क्या मातानुपाती दर वाले 12 भजदूरों और मातानुपाती दर वाले 3 मिस्त्रीयों को, भी इस समय इगमोर डिपो में अस्थायी आधार पर कार्य कर रहे हैं, स्थायी किया जाना चाहिये ?

- (xi) क्या 45 अस्थायी कर्मकार जिनमें 3 मिस्री भी सम्मिलित हैं, 9 त्यौहारी अवकाश दिनों में किए गए काम के लिए मजदूरी के हकदार हैं ?
- (xii) क्या स्थायी कर्मकारों की आकस्मिक छुट्टी, यदि न ली गई हो, आगामी वर्ष में जमा की सकती है ? यदि नहीं, तो क्या पिछले वर्षों में अनुशेष आकस्मिक छुट्टी चालू वर्ष में ली जा सकती है या उसके बदले में कोई प्रतिपाद राशिय है ?
- (xiii) क्या मद्रास पत्तन में भारत का खाद्य निगम के कर्मकारों को समय-समय पर अनुज्ञात सभी फायदों को रंगमोर टिपा के कर्मकारों को भी दिया जा सकता है ?
- (xiv) पक्षकारों के बीच हुए तारीख 9-2-1972 के करार के अनुसार, यह सहमति हो गई थी कि मुख्य मिन्त्रिया और गैर मिन्त्रियों के मूल वेतन को क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, मद्रास के अर्द्ध-सरकारी पत्र सं० एल० 16(10)/70, तारीख 11-6-1971, के आधार पर उन का लागू तत्संबंधी वेतनमानों अर्थात् मुख्य मिन्त्री 185/ रुपये, नॉटिंग गैर मिन्त्री 146/- रुपये और फिलिंग गैर मिन्त्री 146/- रुपये प्रतिमास, को 1-1-1969 से नियत किया जाये और वे उक्त वेतन के आधार पर नमूना भत्ता पाने के पात्र होंगे। परिग्रहण और डाक कर्मकार सघ की वर्तमान मांग यह है कि "अर्थात् कर्मकारी का संबंध मजदूरी के वेतनमान में वेतन नियत करना और 215 सूचकांक पर 99/ रुपये के न्यूनतम महगाई भत्ते का अनुदान वैसे ही किया जाए, जैसा कि मद्रास डाक थम बोर्ड में नियोजित कर्मकारों को अनुदान किया गया है या 1-1-1969 से 1 50 रुपये प्रतिदिन शिक्षा भत्ता मंजूर किया जाए।"
- हम पर नियोजक ने हम आधार पर विवाद उठाया है कि केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट, बेकटाद्री पचाट और उपराक्त निविष्ट करार के अनुसार यह माध्यस्थ के लिए नहीं है। माध्यस्थ से यह अनुरोध किया जाता है कि वह त्रिनिश्चय करे :
- (क) क्या सघ उपरोक्त करार, मजदूरी बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट और पचाट के बावजूद उक्त दावों के लिए दबाव डाल सकता है, और
- (ख) यदि हा, तो क्या सघ की मांग न्यायोचित है और यदि हा तो इसे किम सीमा तक अनुज्ञात किया जाना चाहिए और किस तारीख से ?
- (xv) क्या भारत का खाद्य निगम के कर्मकारों के मामले में उपदान सदाय अधिनियम की धारा 4 के अधीन उपदान के सदाय से संबंधित अधिनियम के उपबन्धों से भिन्न कोई तरीका अपनाये जाने का कोई औचित्य है ? यदि हा तो किम सीमा तक ?
- (xvi) क्या (क) जिन दिनों कर्मकारों को केवल हाजिरी भत्ते की अदायगी की जाती है, उन दिनों के लिए महगाई भत्ते के भुगतान संबंधी प्रश्न 10-2-1971 का श्री टी० बेकटाद्री माध्यस्थ द्वारा दिए गए पचाट के बावजूद पुन उठाया जा सकता है। यदि हा तो क्या ऐसे दिनों के लिए कर्मकारों को महगाई भत्ते की अदायगी की जानी चाहिए और यदि हा, तो किस तारीख से, और
- (ख) क्या हाजिरी भत्ता में कोई बुद्धि न्यायोचित है और यदि हा, तो क्या यह 2 50 रुपये तक बढ़ानी जानी चाहिए और किम तारीख से ?

2 विवाद के पक्षकारों के व्योरे, निर्णोजक का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाला निर्णोजक अन्तर्बलित स्थापन भारत का खाद्य निगम, नई दिल्ली, जिसका या उपक्रम का नाम और प्रतिनिधित्व ज्येष्ठ क्षेत्रीय प्रबन्धक भारत का खाद्य निगम, मद्रास तत्ता भी सम्मिलित है—

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाला

श्री एम० सी० एन्थोनी पिल्ले, परिग्रहण और डाक कर्मकार सघ, मद्रास।

3 प्रश्नगत कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले सघ का नाम, यदि कोई हा — परिग्रहण और डाक कर्मकार सघ मद्रास

1 प्रभावित उपक्रम में नियोजित कर्मकारों की कुल संख्या 105

5 विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित या सम्भावित प्रभावित होने वाले कर्मकारों की प्राक्कलित संख्या 105

पक्षकारों के बीच यह करार हुआ गया है कि उपर्युक्त निर्देश-निबन्धन के अंतर्गत दिया गया पचाट, मद्रास पत्तन में भारत का खाद्य निगम के कर्मकारों की शान्त दिये गये पचाट से भिन्न होगा।

हम यह करार भी करते हैं कि माध्यस्थ का त्रिनिश्चय हम पर बाध्यकारी होगा।

माध्यस्थ अपना पचाट सूचना के भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से चार मास की अवधि या उस तारीख से उतने और समय के भीतर जो हमारे बीच पारस्परिक लिखित करार द्वारा बढ़ाया जाय, देगा। यदि पूर्ववर्णित अवधि या पारस्परिक सहमति से बढ़ाई गई अवधि के भीतर पचाट नहीं दिया जाता तो माध्यस्थ के लिए निर्देश स्वतः रद्द हो जायेगा और हम नये माध्यस्थ के लिए बातचीत करने का स्वतंत्र होंगे।

नियोजक के हस्ताक्षर

ह०/सी० टी० बी० मेनन

18-5-73

ज्येष्ठ क्षेत्रीय प्रबन्धक, भारत का खाद्य निगम, मद्रास शाखी.

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाला

ह०/ एम० सी० एन्थोनी पिल्ले,

अध्यक्ष, परिग्रहण और डाक कर्मकार सघ मद्रास।

1. ह०/अपठनीय

सहायक प्रबन्धक, भारत का खाद्य निगम, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, मद्रास।

2. ह०/अपठनीय

ज्येष्ठ सहायक प्रबन्धक, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, भारत का खाद्य निगम, मद्रास।

ORDER

New Delhi, the 13th July, 1973

S.O. 2052.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to Food Corporation of India, New Delhi and its workmen represented by Transport and Dock Workers Union, Madras.

And, whereas the said employers and workmen have, by a written agreement, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration by the person specified therein, and a copy of the said arbitration agreement has been forwarded to the Central Government.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said arbitration agreement which was received by it on the 25th June, 1973.

AGREEMENT

Agreement for voluntarily referring disputes to Arbitration (Under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

Name of the Parties

Representing the employer:—Food Corporation of India, Represented by:—

Senior Regional Manager, Food Corporation of India, Madras.

Representing the workman:—Shri S. C. C. Anthoni Pillai, President, Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Madras.

Whereas the cargo handling workers of the Food Corporation of India at Egmore Depot resorted to strike on the 20th of February, 1973,

And whereas during the conciliation proceedings held by the regional Labour Commissioner, Madras it was agreed upon by the parties as per the settlement reached under section 12(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act that the demands of the Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Madras as contained in its letters dated 23-2-1973 and 2-3-1973 should be discussed between the parties at the employer's Head Office.

And whereas after the aforesaid discussions between the parties no settlement could be arrived at and as per the said settlement,

Now it is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following specific matters in dispute to the arbitration of Shri K. Srinivasan retired Judge of the Madras High Court for an award and any other directions on merits.

(I) Specific Matters in dispute:—

(i) Whether any increase in the existing minimum guarantee of 18 days is justified? If yes, whether it should be increased to 21 days? and from what date?

(ii) Whether the existing piece-rate scheme should be revised as an incentive piece rate scheme? If yes, the mode of the scheme and the date from which it should be made effective may be indicated.

(NOTE.—The employer has agreed to the framing of an incentive piece-rate scheme for the workers).

(iii) Whether the present mode of calculation of differential pay admissible to a Maistry when he is on piece rate is being correctly adopted per agreement dated 9-2-1972? If, not, in what manner it should be calculated and from what date?

(iv) Whether the out-door medical facilities be extended to the families of the workers and if so, from what date?

(NOTE.—the employer has agreed to the extension of this facility in principle).

(v) Can attendance allowance, disappointment wage and city compensatory allowance be added towards and wages of a workman for the purpose of CPF deduction?

(vi) Whether a Labour Welfare Fund be constituted on the basis of the one framed by the Madras Dock Labour Board or it should be constituted per the Model Scheme framed by the Government of India for Central Industrial Undertakings as per Department of Labour Memorandum No. DW 18(1)/46 dated 16th December, 1946 or any other basis and if so, from what date?

(vii) House Rent Allowance and City Compensatory Allowance are being paid on monthly basis to all workmen, Whether while calculating the wages for the work put in by a workman on non-closed festival holidays these allowances have to be added up again?

(viii) Whether the fixation of pay of the 45 temporary workers inclusive of 3 Maistries at Egmore Depot should take effect from 1-1-1969 and not from 1-8-1971?

(ix) Whether the workers at Egmore Depot are to be provided with Uniforms?

(x) Whether 42 piece-rates mazdoors and 3 piece rated Maistries who are working on temporary basis at present at Egmore Depot should be made permanent?

(xi) Whether the 45 temporary workers including 3 Maistries are entitled to wages for 9 non-closed festival holidays.

(xii) Whether Casual leave for permanent workers, if not availed of, accumulates in the ensuing year? If not whether Casual Leave permissible in the past years can be availed of in the current year or any compensation is payable in lieu of the same.

(xiii) Whether all benefits allowed to Food Corporation of India workers at Madras Port from time to time can be extended to the workers at Egmore Depot.

(xiv) For agreement dated 9-2-1972 arrived at between the parties, it was agreed that the basic pay of Head Maistries and Gang Maistries should be fixed on the basis of the letter of the Zonal Office, Madras D.O. Letter No. L16(10)/70 dated 11-6-1971 with effect from 1-1-1969 in the respective pay scales applicable to them, viz., Head Maistries Rs. 185 Loading Gang Maistries Rs. 146 and Filling Gang Maistries Rs. 146 per month and they would be eligible for the appropriate allowance on the basis of the said pay. The present demand of the Transport and Dock Workers Union is that "Fixation of pay of each employee in the concerned wages Board Scale and grant of minimum dearness Allowances of Rs. 99 at index 215 should be as has been allowed to the workers employed by the Madras Dock Labour Board or grant of an Education allowance of Rs. 1.50 per day with effect from 1-1-1969". This is disputed by the employer on the ground that per Central Wages Board Report, Venkatadri award and the agreement referred to above, it is not open to arbitration. The arbitrator is requested to decide:

(a) Whether the Union can press the said claims despite the above agreement wage board report and award and

(b) If yes, whether the demand of the Union is justified and if so, to what extent should it be allowed and from what date?

(xv) Whether there is any justification for making a departure from the provisions of the payment of Gratuity Act relating to the payment of Gratuity under section 4 of the Act in the Case of Food Corporation of India workers? If yes, to what extent?

(xvi) Whether (a) the question regarding payment of D.A. for the days on which the workmen are paid attendance allowance only can be reopened, despite the

award dated 10-2-1971 made by Shri F. Venkatahari, arbitrator. If yes, whether the D.A. should be paid to the workmen for such days; and if so from what date, and

- (b) Whether any increase in the attendance allowance is justified and if so, whether it should be increased up to Rs 2.50 and from what date?

2. Details of the parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved:—

Representing the Employer.—Food Corporation of India New Delhi represented by Senior Regional Manager, Food Corporation of India, Madras.

Representing the workmen.—Shri S. C. C. Anthoni Pillai. Transport and Dock Workers' Union Madras.

3. Name of the union, if any, representing the worker in question:—

Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Madras.

4. Total No. of workers employed in the undertaking affected. 105

5. Estimated No. of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute. 105

It has been agreed between the parties that the award given under the above terms of reference would be independent of the award made in respect of the Food Corporation of India workers at Madras Port.

We further agree that the decision of the arbitrator shall be binding on us.

The arbitrator shall make his award within a period of four months from the date of publication of the notice in the gazette of India or within such further time from that date as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period aforementioned or the period extended by mutual consent, the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitrations.

Signature of Employer

Representing workmen

Sd/-
C.T.B. Menon
18-5-1973

Sd/-
S. C. C. Anthony Pillai

Senior Regional Manager, Food Corporation of India, Madras.

President, Transport and Dock Workers' Union Madras.

Witnesses:

1. Sd/- Illegible Assistant Manager, Food Corporation of India Zonal Office, Madras.
2. Sd/- Illegible Senior Assistant Manager, Zonal Office, Food Corporation of India, Madras.

[No. L. 42013/8/73/LRHH]

आदेश

का० प्रा० 2053—यतः भारत का खाद्य निगम, नई दिल्ली ने सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व परिवहन और डाक कर्मकार संघ, मद्रास करता है, के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है,

और यतः उक्त नियोजकों और कर्मकारों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा

(1) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में एक विनिश्चित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को उससे विनिश्चित व्यक्ति द्वारा माध्यस्थता के लिए निर्दिष्ट करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त माध्यस्थता करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार को भेजी है;

अतः, अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त माध्यस्थता करार को, जो उसे 25 जून, 1973 को मिला था, प्रकाशित करती है।

करार

विवादों को माध्यस्थता से निर्दिष्ट करने के लिए करार (औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन)

पक्षकारों के नाम

नियोजक का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाला: भारत का खाद्य निगम नई दिल्ली, जिसका प्रतिनिधित्व सयुक्त प्रबन्धक (पत्तन सक्रियण), भारत का खाद्य निगम, मद्रास करता है।

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले (1) श्री एम० सी० सी० एथोनी पिल्लै, अध्यक्ष, परिवहन और डाक कर्मकार संघ, मद्रास और

(2) श्री ई० एम० डब्ल्यू० डेविड, मद्रास पत्तन में भारत का खाद्य निगम के विभागीय कर्मकारों का निर्वाचित प्रतिनिधि।

यतः मद्रास पत्तन में भारत का खाद्य निगम के स्थोरा उठाने वाले कर्मकारों ने 20 फरवरी, 1973 को हड़ताल की;

और यतः क्षेत्रीय श्रम आयुक्त, मद्रास द्वारा की गई सुलझ कार्यवाहियों के दौरान पक्षकारों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम की धारा 12(3) के अधीन हुए समझौते के अनुसार यह करार किया था कि परिवहन और डाक कर्मकार संघ, मद्रास की उनके तारीख 23-2-1973 और 2-3-1973 वाले पत्रों में दी गई मांगों (और श्री ई० एम० डब्ल्यू० डेविड द्वारा हस्ताक्षरित तारीख 15-2-1973 वाले पत्र में दी गई मांगों) पर पक्षकारों के बीच नियोजक के कार्यालय में विचार-विमर्श किया जाना चाहिए,

और यतः पूर्वोक्त विचार-विमर्श के पश्चात् पक्षकारों के बीच उक्त समझौते के अनुसार कोई समझौता न हो सका,

अब पक्षकारों के बीच यह करार किया गया है कि निम्नलिखित विनिश्चित विवादग्रस्त विषयों को गुणागुण के आधार पर पञ्चाट या किन्हीं अन्य निर्देशों के लिए श्री के० श्रीनिवासन, सेवा-निवृत्त न्यायाधीश, मद्रास उच्च न्यायालय, के माध्यस्थता के लिए निर्दिष्ट किया जाए।

1. विनिश्चित विवादग्रस्त विषय

(i) क्या 18 दिन की वर्तमान न्यूनतम गारन्टी में कोई वृद्धि न्यायोचित है? यदि हाँ, तो क्या इसे 21 दिन तक बढ़ाया जाना चाहिए और किस तारीख से?

(ii) नियोजक ने प्रोत्साहन मासानुपाती दर स्कीम का एक प्रारूप तैयार किया था और कर्मकारों के उपर्युक्त दो प्रतिनिधियों से टिप्पणियाँ मांगी गई थी। उनमें यह भी अनुरोध किया गया था कि पूर्वोक्त प्रोत्साहन मासानुपाती दर स्कीम के प्रारूप की परीक्षा करने के लिए वे नियोजक द्वारा गठित समिति के सदस्यों के रूप में अपने को सहयुक्त कहे ताकि आवश्यक उपान्तरणों के बाद उसे कार्यान्विता किया जा सके। श्री एथोनी पिल्लै ने अपने पत्र तारीख 12-3-1973 द्वारा

इसमें कार्य करने में इतर कर दिया और स्कीम का सम्पूर्ण नाम भूल कर दिया। श्री वैविशने अपने पत्र तारीख 9-3-1973 द्वारा स्कीम की अपनी अस्वीकृति भेज दी। क्षेत्रीय श्रम आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), मद्रास के समक्ष 20-3-1973 का निष्पादित समझौता ज्ञापन द्वारा यह विनिश्चय किया गया कि यदि पक्षकार आपस में किसी विनिश्चय पर न पहुँचे तो उपर्युक्त स्कीम का तैयार करने का काम मध्यस्थ पर छोड़ दिया जाएगा। कोई समझौता न हो सका। अतः मध्यस्थ से अनुरोध है कि यह नियोजक की मातानुपाती दर स्कीम में प्रारूप और ऐसी किसी अन्य स्कीम या स्कीमा की भी जो पक्षकारों में से किसी पक्षकार द्वारा प्रस्तुत की जाए, परीक्षा करे और तत्पश्चात् इनमें से किसी एक स्कीम को कार्यान्वित करने का निदेश दे या ऐसी स्कीमों में से किसी स्कीम में समोधन करे और उसके कार्यान्वयन के लिए निदेश दे या अपनी ही कोई स्कीम तैयार करे और ऐसी तारीख/तारीखों का जिस/जिनमें मद्रास स्थित डाक श्रम बोर्ड/पत्तन न्याय द्वारा मातानुपाती दर स्कीम के पुनरीक्षण का प्रभावी किया गया है ध्यान में रखते हुए, उसके कार्यान्वयन का निदेश दे।

(III) क्या कोई कर्मकार, जो अपने वेतन-मान में अधिकतम वेतन पा रहा है और आगे वृद्धि का हकदार है? यदि हाँ, तो किस सीमा तक और किस रीति में और किस तारीख से?

(IV) क्या किसी मिस्त्री को, जबकि वह मातानुपाती दर पर हो, अनुसूच्य अन्तरीय वेतन की सगणना करने का वर्तमान हक 9-2-1972 के करार के अनुसार ठीक रूप में अपनाया जा रहा है? यदि नहीं तो उसकी सगणना किस रीति में की जानी चाहिए और किस तारीख से?

(V) क्या बहिरंग चिकित्सा सम्बन्धी मुविधाएँ कर्मकारों के कुटुम्बों को भी दी जाएँ और यदि हाँ, तो किस तारीख से?

टिप्पण नियोजक सिद्धान्त रूप में यह सुविधा देने के लिए सहमत हो गया है।

(VI) क्या अणदायी भविष्य निधि सम्बन्धी कटौतियों के प्रयोजन के लिए हाजिरी भत्ता, समायाजन भत्ता, आशा-भग मजदूरी और नगर प्रतिवर भत्ता किसी कर्मकार की मजदूरी में जोड़ा जा सकता है?

(VII) क्या मद्रास डाक श्रम बोर्ड द्वारा बनाई गई निधि के आधार पर श्रम कल्याण निधि गठित की जाए या उसे श्रम विभाग के ज्ञापन संख्या एल० डब्ल्यू/18(1)/46 तारीख 16 दिसम्बर, 1946 के अनुसार भारत सरकार द्वारा केन्द्रीय औद्योगिक उपक्रमों के लिए तैयार की गई आदर्श स्कीम के अनुसार या किसी अन्य आधार पर गठित किया जाना चाहिये और यदि हाँ तो किस तारीख से?

(VIII) गृह भाटक भत्ता और नगर प्रतिवर भत्ता सभी कर्मकारों को मासिक आधार पर दिया जा रहा है, तो क्या किसी कर्मकार द्वारा त्यौहारी अवकाश दिना में दिए गए काम के लिए मजदूरी की सगणना करने समय इन भत्तों को पुनः जोड़ा जाए।

(IX) क्या मातानुपाती दर पर नियोजित श्रमिकों के, जब कि वे दूसरी या तीसरी पांगी में नियोजित हों, समायोजन भत्ते की सगणना का प्रचलित हक संतोषजनक है? यदि नहीं, तो कौन सा तरीका अपनाया जाना चाहिए और किस तारीख से?

(X) (क) क्या हम कमबारा का, जो स्वच्छता निवृत्ति स्कीम के अधीन 1972 में पहले ही सेवा-निवृत्त हो चुके हैं और जिन्हें उसके अधीन सेवा-निवृत्त प्रतिकर दिया जा चुका हो, न ली गई छुट्टी के लिये कोई और सदाय किया जाना चाहिए?

(XI) क्या नियोजक द्वारा उर्वरक उठाने वाले कर्मकारों को सुरक्षामक उपस्कर दिया जाता है? यदि हाँ, तो उपस्कर के स्वरूप की परिभाषा की जाए।

(XII) (क) पक्षकारों के बीच हुए तारीख 9-2-1972 के करार के अनुसार यह सहमति हो गई थी कि मुख्य मिस्त्रियों और गैंग मिस्त्रियों के मूल वेतन को, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय मद्रास के अर्ध-सरकारी पत्र संख्या एल-16(10)/70, तारीख 11-6-1971 के आधार पर, उनको लागू तत्संबंधी वेतनमानों, अर्थात् मुख्य मिस्त्री 185 रुपये, लोडिंग गैंग मिस्त्री 146 रुपये और फिलिंग गैंग मिस्त्री 146 रुपये प्रतिमास की 1-1-1969 से नियत किया जाए और वे उक्त वेतन के आधार पर समुचित भत्तों के पात्र होंगे। परिवहन और डाक कर्मकार सघ की वर्तमान मांग यह है कि "प्रत्येक कर्मकार का मजदूर मजदूरी बोर्ड के वेतनमान में वेतन नियत करना और 215 मूषकाक पर 99 रुपये के न्यूनतम महगाई भत्ते का अनुदान वैसे ही किया जाए, जैसा कि मद्रास डाक श्रमिक बोर्ड में नियोजित कर्मकारों को अनुज्ञात किया गया है अथवा 1-1-1969 से 1.50 रुपये प्रतिदिन शिक्षा भत्ता मजूर किया जाए।" नियोजक द्वारा इसका विरोध इस आधार पर किया गया है कि केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट, बैकटाडी पचाट और उपर्युक्त निर्दिष्ट करार के अनुसार यह माध्यस्थता के लिये नहीं है। मध्यस्थ से यह अनुरोध किया जाता है कि वह —

(क) यह विनिश्चय करे कि क्या सघ उपर्युक्त करार, मजदूरी बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट और पचाट के बावजूद उक्त दावों के लिये दबाव डाल सकता है; और

(ख) यदि हाँ, तो क्या सघ की मांग व्यापक है और यदि हाँ, तो इसे किस सीमा तक अनुज्ञात किया जाना चाहिये और किस तारीख से?

(XII) (ख) क्या नियोजक द्वारा कर्मकारों के वेतन का नियतन मद्रास पत्तन के पत्तन तथा डाक कर्मकारों में संबंधित केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट (1969) और श्री टी० बैकटाडी द्वारा 10-2-1971 के पचाट के और स्पष्टीकरण के अनुसार किया गया है।

(XIII) क्या भारत का खाद्य निगम के कर्मकारों के मामले में, उपदान सदाय अधिनियम की धारा 4 के अधीन उपदान के संवाय से संबंधित अधिनियम के उपबन्धों में भिन्न कोई तरीका अपनाए जाने का औचित्य है? यदि हाँ, तो किस सीमा तक?

(XIV) क्या (क) जिन दिनों कर्मकारों को केवल हाजिरी भत्ते की अदायगी की जाती है, उन दिनों के लिये महगाई भत्ते के भुगतान संबंधी प्रश्न, 10-2-1971 को श्री टी० बैकटाडी माध्यस्थ द्वारा दिये गए पचाट के बावजूद पुनः उठाया जा सकता है, यदि हाँ तो क्या ऐसे दिनों के लिये कर्मकारों को महगाई भत्ते की अदायगी की जानी चाहिये, और यदि हाँ, तो किस तारीख से और (ख) क्या हाजिरी भत्ते में कोई वृद्धि न्यायोचित है और यदि हाँ, तो क्या यह 2.50 रुपये तक बढ़ा दी जानी चाहिये और किस तारीख से?

(XV) क्या 50-ग प्रवर्ग फिलर/मिटर, जिन्होंने वर्ष 1970 के दौरान कोई कार्य नहीं किया था, तारीख 16-11-1970 और 9-2-1972 के करार के अनुसार प्रतिकर के भुगतान के हकदार हैं?

2. विवाद के पक्षकारों के बीच, जिनमें अनंतवलिन स्थापन या उपक्रम का नाम और पता भी सम्मिलित है।

नियोजक का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाला भारत का खाद्य निगम, नई दिल्ली, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व संयुक्त प्रबन्धक (डाकघर) मद्रास करता है।

कर्मकार का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले

(1) श्री एम० सी० सी० एंथोनी पिल्ले, अध्यक्ष, परिवहन और डाक कर्मकार संघ, मद्रास और

(2) श्री ई० एम० डब्ल्यू० डेविड, मद्रास पत्तन में भारत का खाद्य निगम के विभागीय कर्मकारों का निर्वाचित प्रतिनिधि।

3. प्रश्नगत कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले संघ का नाम, यदि कोई हो।

परिवहन और डाक कर्मकार संघ, मद्रास।

4. प्रभावित उपक्रम में नियोजित कर्मकारों की कुल संख्या। 1262

5. विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित या संभाव्यतः प्रभावित होने वाले कर्मकारों की प्राक्कलिप्त संख्या 1262

पक्षकारों के बीच यह करार हो गया है कि उपर्युक्त निर्देश नियंधन के अन्तर्गत दिया गया पंचाट, एम्मा डिपो में भारत का खाद्य निगम के डिपो कर्मकारों की बाबत दिये गए पंचाट से भिन्न होगा।

हम यह करार भी करते हैं कि मध्यस्थ का विनिश्चय हम पर बाबजुब होगा।

मध्यस्थ अपना पंचाट सूचना के भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से चार मास की अवधि या उस तारीख से हटने और समय के शीघ्र जो हमारे पारस्परिक लिखित करार द्वारा बढ़ाया जाए, देगा। यदि पूर्व वर्णित अवधि या पारस्परिक सहमति से बढ़ाई गई अवधि के भीतर पंचाट नहीं दिया जाता, तो माध्यस्थ्य के लिये निर्देश स्वतः रह हो जाएगा और हम नये माध्यस्थ्य के लिये बातचीत करने को स्वतंत्र होंगे।

नियोजक के हस्ताक्षर कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले

ह०/- एम० सुन्दर राजन,
संयुक्त प्रबन्धक
(पत्तन सक्रिया),

(1) ह०/-
(एम० सी० सी० एंथोनी पिल्ले),
अध्यक्ष,

भारत का खाद्य निगम, मद्रास।
भारत का खाद्य निगम, नई दिल्ली
के लिये और उमकी और से।

परिवहन और डाक कर्मकार संघ, मद्रास।

(2) ह०/-
(ई० एम० डब्ल्यू० डेविड),
मद्रास पत्तन में भारत का खाद्य निगम के
विभागीय कर्मकारों का निर्वाचित प्रतिनिधि।

साक्षी

1. ह०/- एम० बी० चारी,
उप-प्रबन्धक, भारत का खाद्य
निगम, मद्रास-1

2. ह०/- अपठनीय,
ज्येष्ठ सहायक प्रबन्धक,
भारत का खाद्य निगम,
मद्रास।

(संख्या एल० 42013(8)/73 एल० आर०-3)

कर्नेल सिंह

ORDER

S.O. 2053.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to Food Corporation of India, New Delhi and its workmen represented by Transport and Dock Workers Union, Madras.

And, whereas the said employers and workmen have, by a written agreement, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration by the person specified therein, and a copy of the said arbitration agreement has been forwarded to the Central Government.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said arbitration agreement which was received by it on the 25th June, 1973

AGREEMENT

AGREEMENT FOR VOLUNTARILY REFERRING DISPUTES TO ARBITRATION

(Under section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

Names of Parties

Representing employers.—Food Corporation of India New Delhi represented by Joint Manager (Port Operations), Food Corporation of India, Madras.

Representing Workmen.—(i) Shri S.C.C. Anthoni Pillal, President, Transport and Dock Workers Union, Madras, and

(ii) Shri E.M.W. David, elected representative of the Food Corporation of India, Departmental Workers at Madras Port.

WHEREAS the cargo handling workers of the Food Corporation of India at Madras Port resorted to a strike on the 20th of February 1973,

AND WHEREAS during the conciliation proceedings held by the Regional Labour Commissioner, Madras it was agreed upon by the parties as per the settlement reached under Section 12(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act that the demands of the Transport and Dock Workers Union, Madras as contained in its letters dated 23-2-1973 and 2-3-1973 (and the demands as contained in the letter dated 15-2-1973 signed by Shri E.M.W. David) should be discussed between the parties at the employer's Head Office,

AND WHEREAS after the aforesaid discussions between the parties, no settlement could be arrived at and as per the said settlement,

NOW IT IS HEREBY AGREED between the parties to refer the following specific matters in dispute to the arbitration of Shri K. Srinivasan, retired Judge of the Madras High Court for an award or any other directions on merits.

(1) Specific matters in dispute:

(i) Whether any increase in the existing minimum guarantee of 18 days is justified? If yes, whether it should be increased upto 21 days and from what date?

(ii) A draft of the Incentive Piece Rate Scheme was framed by the employer and comments from the two above-mentioned representatives of workers were invited. They were also requested to associate themselves as Members of a Committee constituted by the employer to examine the aforesaid draft

Incentive Piece Rate Scheme so that it could be implemented after necessary modifications. Shri Anthoni Pillai refused to serve upon it per his letter dated 12-3-1973 and rejected the Scheme in its entirety. Shri David as per his letter dated 9-3-1973 also communicated his rejection of the Scheme. Per Memorandum of Settlement executed with them before the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Madras on 20-3-1973, it was decided that in case the parties do not come to a decision by themselves, the question of framing the above Scheme will be left to the Arbitrator. No settlement could be reached. Hence the Arbitrator is requested to examine the draft Piece Rate Scheme of the employer and also any other scheme or schemes which may be submitted by either of the parties and thereafter direct implementation of any one of these schemes or modify any of such schemes and direct its implementation thereof or frame a scheme of his own, and direct implementation thereof from a date, keeping in mind the date/dates from which revision of piece rates schemes are made effective by the Dock Labour Board/Ports Trust at Madras.

- (iii) Whether a workman who is drawing the maximum pay, in his pay scale, is entitled to a further increase? If yes, to what extent and in what manner and from what date?
- (iv) Whether the present mode of calculation of differential pay admissible to a Maistry, when he is on piece-rate, is being correctly adopted per agreement dated 9-2-1972. If not in what manner it should be calculated and from what date?
- (v) Whether the out-door medical facilities be extended to the families of the workers and if so, from what date?

NOTE.—The employer has agreed to the extension of this facility in principle.

- (vi) Can attendance allowance, adjustment allowance, disappointment wage and city compensatory allowance be added towards the wages of a workman for the purpose of CPF deductions?
- (vii) Whether a Labour Welfare Fund be constituted on the basis of the one framed by the Madras Dock Labour Board or it should be constituted per the Model Scheme framed by the Government of India for Central Industrial Undertakings per Department of Labour Memorandum No. LW/18(1)/46 dated 16th December, 1946 or any other basis and if so, from what date?
- (viii) House Rent Allowance and City Compensatory Allowance are being paid on monthly basis to all workmen. Whether while calculating the wages for the work put in by workman on non-closed festival holidays these allowances have to be added up again?
- (ix) Whether the prevailing mode of calculating adjustment allowance for the piece-rated workers, when employed in the second and third shifts, is satisfactory? If not, what pattern should be adopted and if so from what Date?
- (x) Whether workmen having already retired under the Voluntary Retirement Scheme in 1972 and having been paid retirement compensation thereunder should be allowed any further payment against un-availed leave?
- (xi) Whether protective equipment is to be supplied by the employer to the workmen handling fertiliser? If yes, the nature of equipment be defined?
- (xii-A) Per agreement dated 9-2-1972 arrived at between the parties, it was agreed that the basic pay of Head Maistries and Garg Maistries should be fixed on the basis of the letter of the Zonal Office, Madras D.O. Letter No. L. 16(10)/70 dated 11-6-1971 with effect from 1-1-1969 in the respective pay scales applicable to them, viz. Head Maistries Rs. 185/-, Leading Gang Maistries Rs. 146/- and filling Gang Maistries Rs. 146/- per month and they would be eligible for the appropriate allowances on the basis of the said pay. The present demand

of the Transport and Dock Workers Union is that "fixation of pay of each employee in the concerned Wage Board Scale and grant of minimum dearness allowance of Rs. 99/- at index 215, should be as has been allowed to the workers employed by the Madras Dock Labour Board, or grant of an Education allowance of Rs. 1.50 per day with effect from 1-1-1969. This is disputed by the employer on the ground that per Central Wage Board report, Venkatadri award and the agreement referred to above, it is not open to arbitration. The arbitrator is requested to:

- (a) decide whether the Union can press the said claims despite the above agreement wage Board report and award, and
- (b) If yes, whether the demand of the Union is justified and if so to what extent it should be allowed and from what date?
- (xii-B) Whether fixation of pay of the workers by the employer has been done according to the report of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers at Major Ports (1969) and further elucidated by the award dated 10-2-1971 by Shri T. Venkatari.
- (xiii) Whether there is any justification for making a departure from the provisions of the Payment of Gratuity Act relating to the payment of gratuity under Section 4 of the Act in the case of Food Corporation of India Workers? If yes, to what extent?
- (xiv) Whether (a) the question regarding payment of D.A. for the days on which the workmen are paid attendance allowance only can be re-opened, despite the award dated 10-2-1971 made by Shri T. Venkatadri, arbitrator. If yes, whether the D.A. should be paid to the workmen for such days, and if so, from what date, and (b) whether any increase in the attendance allowance is justified and if so whether it should be increased upto Rs. 2.50 and from what date?
- (xv) Whether the 51-C category fillers/stitchers who had not put in any work during the year 1970 are entitled to payment of compensation per agreement dated 16-11-1970 and 9-2-1972?

2. Details of the Parties to the dispute including the Name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved:

Representing the employer.—Food Corporation of India, New Delhi represented by Joint Manager (P.O.), Madras.

Representing the workmen.—

1. Shri S.C.C. Anthoni Pillai, President, Transport and Dock Workers Union, Madras

AND

2. Shri F.M.W. David, elected representative of the Food Corporation of India Department Workmen at Madras Port.

- (3) Name of the Union, if any representing the workmen in question;

Transport and Dock Workers Union, Madras

- (4) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected: 1262

- (5) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute: 1262

It has been agreed between the parties that the award given under the above terms of reference would be independent of the award made in respect of the Food Corporation of India Depot Workers at Egmore Depot.

We further agree that the decision of the arbitrator shall be binding on us.

The Arbitrator shall make his award within a period of four months from the date of publication of the notice in the Gazette of India or within such further time from that date as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period aforementioned or the period extended by mutual consent, the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration.

Signature of employer.

Sd/- S. Sundararajan,
Joint Manager (Port Operations)
Food Corporation of India,

Madras.

For and on behalf of the Food
Corporation of India, New Delhi.

Representing workmen

- (i) Sd/-
(S. C. C. Anthoni Pillai)
President,
Transport & Dock Workers Union, Madras.
- (ii) Sd/-
(E. M. W. DAVID)
Elected Representative of
Food Corporation of
India, Departmental
Workers at Madras Port.

WITNESSES:—

- (1) Sd/- N. V. Chari, Deputy Manager,
Food Corporation of India,
Madras-1.
- (2) Sd/- Illegible
Sr. Assistant Manager,
Food Corporation of India,
Madras.

[No. L. 42013/8/73/LR III]
KARNAIL SINGH, Under Secy.

New Delhi 9 July, 1973

S.O. 2054.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Madras, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Salem Magnesite (Private) Limited, Hasthampatti Extension, Salem-7 and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 28th June, 1973.

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, MADRAS (CONSTITUTED BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT)

New Delhi, 19th June, 1973

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 45 of 1972

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workmen and the Management of M/s. Salem Magnesite Private Limited, Salem).

Between :

The workmen, represented by

- (i) The General Secretary, Salem District Magnesite Labour Union, Suramangalam, Salem-5.
- (2) The General Secretary, Magnesite Workers' Union, Mamangam, Jagir Reddipatti Post, Omalur Road, Salem-5.

AND

M/s. Salem Magnesite Private Limited, Hasthampatti Extension, Salem-7.

Reference :

Order No. L-27011/2/72-LR-IV, dated 10-11-1972.
Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, Government of India, New Delhi.

This dispute coming on this day for final disposal upon perusing the reference, claim and counter statements and all other material papers on record and the parties being absent and an application having been filed by Union No. 2 for not pressing the dispute and recording the same, this Tribunal made the following

AWARD

This is an industrial dispute between the workers and the management of M/s. Salem Magnesite Private Limited, Salem referred by the Central Government to this Tribunal for adjudication.

(2) The point for adjudication is as follows:—

“Whether the demand of the workmen employed by Messrs. Salem Magnesite Private Ltd. Hasthampatti Extension, Salem-7, for payment of seventh day wages to Balli workers who are recruited after 1st July, 1960 and have completed twelve months service is justified? If so, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?”

(3) Parties were served with summons. The workers represented by two unions have filed their claim statements and in repudiation thereof a counter statement was filed by the management.

(4) From the beginning, union No. 1 was absent. The dispute was posted for enquiry on 20-3-1973, 2-4-1973, 23-4-1973, 4-6-1973 and 19-6-1973. On all the dates mentioned above, nobody was present for union No. 1. No interest was shown by union No. 1 in this dispute. I presume that union No. 1 has no interest to conduct the case.

(5) So far as union No. 2 is concerned, an application signed by its general Secretary was received stating that the matter is not pressed and that dispute may be dismissed. I have recorded the application.

(6) In view of the above, an award is passed against the workers.

Dated this 19th day of June, 1973

G. GOPINATH,
Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal

[No. L-27011/2/72-LR IV]

S.O. 2055.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Chowgule and Company, Pvt. Ltd., Mormugao Harbour (Goa) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 3rd July, 1973.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2, BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-2/13 of 1971

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF MESSRS CHOWGULE AND COMPANY PVT. LTD., MORMUGAO HARBOUR (GOA)

AND

THEIR WORKMAN

Present :

Shri N. K. Vani—Presiding Officer

Appearances :

For the Employers—Shri D. P. Sinha, Labour Officer.

For the workman—Shri U. Dinker, (Self)

Industry : Iron Ore Mines. **State :** Goa, Daman & Diu.
Bombay, dated the 20th June, 1973.

AWARD

By Order No. L-29012/32/71-LRIV dated the 16-12-1971 the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) referred to this Tribunal for adjudication an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Chowgule and Company Private Limited, Mormugao Harbour and their workman in respect of the matters specified in the schedule as mentioned below:—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Messrs. Chowgule and Company Private Limited, Mormugao Harbour (Goa) in terminating the services of Shri U. Dinker, Head Storekeeper, Pale Mines with effect from 12th June 1971 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. The facts giving rise to this reference are as follows:—

- (i) The workman Shri U. Dinker raised an industrial dispute by his letter dated 20-6-1971 addressed to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-de-Gama stating that he had been working in the capacity of Head Storekeeper from 13-1-1967, that he came to know certain malpractices practised by certain officers and before these malpractices could be brought to the notice of the company his services were terminated suddenly by the company on 12-1-1971 for malafide reasons.
- (ii) The Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) heard the parties and tried to bring about conciliation but in vain. He therefore submitted his failure of conciliation report to the Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Labour and Employment. On account of this the Government of India referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

3. After the receipt of the reference notices were issued to the parties to file their statement. In pursuance of these notices, Messrs Chowgule and Company Pvt. Ltd., Mormugao Harbour (hereinafter referred to as the company) have filed written statement at Ex. 1/E and rejoinder at Ex. 5/E. The affected workman Shri U. Dinker has filed his written statement at Ex. 2/W and rejoinder to company's statement at Ex. 3/W.

4. The affected workman Shri U. Dinker, examined himself at Ex. 6/W and two witnesses viz. Shri Amrut Pandurang Shirodkar Ex. 114/W and Shri Appasaheb Jotirao Shinde, Ex. 115/W. He has produced number of documents.

5. The company has examined Shri Surrendra Vishwanath Borker, Senior Accountant at Ex. 34/E, Shri Laxmikant D. Samat, Manager Mines and P. Plant at Ex. 35/E and Shri Juniant Rodrigues, at Ex. 112/E. The company has also produced many documents on record.

6. The company by its written statement Ex. 1/E has raised various preliminary objections in paras. 1 to 5 and requested this Tribunal to decide these preliminary objections first before considering the reference on merit. The reference is however heard on all points recording evidence both oral and documentary.

7. According to the company's written statement Ex. 1/E:—

- (i) As the cause of Shri U. Dinker has not been espoused by any workmen employed in the company, there is no industrial dispute existing and this reference ought to be rejected.

(ii) If the Tribunal comes to the conclusion that this reference has been made under Section 2A of the I.D. Act, 1947, the reference is bad in law and not maintainable as Section 2A of the I.D. Act, is ultra vires the Constitution of India.

(iii) Section 2A of the I.D. Act is void and illegal as it offends the provisions of Article 14 of the Constitution because it confers unbridled, unguided and discriminatory powers on the Government under Section 10 of the Act. The power which the appropriate Government enjoys under Section 10 results in discrimination when applied to cases coming within the scope of Section 2A. Hence this reference under Section 2A is bad in law.

(iv) Shri U. Dinker is not a workman within the meaning of Section 2 (s) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Hence this reference is bad in law and not maintainable. Shri Dinker was appointed in Supervisory capacity. He performed supervisory duty. He is not therefore a workman within the meaning of the Act.

(v) The services of Shri U. Dinker were terminated by letter dated 12-6-1971 in accordance with clause (5) of the appointment letter dated 26-11-1966 because his work was not satisfactory and because he showed no improvement in his work.

8. Shri D. P. Sinha, Labour Officer, appeared on behalf of the company before me on 7-5-1973. In his arguments he has raised the question about the jurisdiction saying that there is no industrial dispute existing between the company and Shri U. Dinker because Shri Dinker had not made any demand for reinstatement before the company and that he made the demand for reinstatement for the first time before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-de-Gama. As this question of jurisdiction goes to the root of the case, I allowed this point to be raised though it was not specifically taken in the written statement Ex. 1/E.

9. Points for consideration are as follows:—

- (i) Whether this Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain this reference?
- (ii) Whether the reference is bad in law?
- (iii) What order?

10. My findings are as follows:—

- (i) No.
- (ii) Yes.
- (iii) As per order.

REASONS

Point Nos. i & ii

11. Shri Sinha, Labour Officer of the company contends that the dispute between the company and Shri U. Dinker is not an industrial dispute because this is a dispute between the company and a single individual and because the same is not raised by a body of employees or by the Union. In support of this contention he relies on Section 2(k) of the I. D. Act, 1947.

12. Section 2 (k) of the I.D. Act, 1947 is as follows:—

"(k) 'industrial dispute' means any dispute or difference between employers and employers or between employers and workmen or between workmen and workmen, which is connected with the employment or non-employment or the terms of employment or with the conditions of labour, of any person."

13. A perusal of the above Section shows that prima facie the present dispute between the company and Shri U. Dinker is not an industrial dispute within the meaning of Section 2(k) of the I. D. Act, 1947 because it is not

a dispute between the employer and a body of workmen and because it is a dispute between the employer and a single workman.

14. Section 2A of the I.D. Act, 1947 has been inserted by Act 35 of 1965. This Section 2A is as follows:—

"2. A Dismissal etc. of an individual workman to be deemed to be an industrial dispute:—Where any employer discharges, dismisses, retrenches or otherwise terminates the services of an individual workman, any dispute or difference between that workman and his employer connected with or arising out of, such discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination shall be deemed to be an industrial dispute notwithstanding that no other workman nor any union of workmen is a party to the dispute".

15. In view of the introduction of Section 2A referred to above there cannot be any doubt that the dispute between an employer and a single workman becomes an industrial dispute though no other workman or any union of workman is a party to the dispute.

16. Shri Sinha for the company contends that though the present dispute is an industrial dispute within the meaning of Section 2A of the I.D. Act, 1947, yet the reference made to this Tribunal is bad in law because Section 2A is void and illegal, as it offends the provisions of Article 14 of the Constitution. In support of this he relies on the ruling of the Calcutta High Court in the case between Jute and Jute Goods Butler Stock Association Vs. The Second Industrial Tribunal of West Bengal and others, reported in 1972 Lab. I.C. 503 by stating that this ruling has been referred in the arguments advanced in reference No. CGIT-2A of 1972. This ruling is as follows:—

"Section 2-A is void since the power of Government under Section 10 is unprincipled as applied to cases of individual disputes deemed to be industrial disputes under Section 2-A AIR 1957 SC 329 and AIR 1957 SC 532 Rel. on AIR 1970 Mys 171 and AIR 1970 Delhi 60 and AIR 1970 MAD 82 distinguished AIR 1971 Punj and Har 60 Doubtful (Para. 30).

The Supreme Court laid down criteria for the exercise of discretion under Section 10 for collective disputes do not apply to Section 10 references of individual disputes under Section 2-A because there can be no threat of interruption of production or of industrial strike or breach of industrial peace in cases of individual disputes. Section 10 discretion of the Government is rendered unguided on account of its being free to make a reference in the case of one workman and refuse a reference in the case of another although both of them may be situated in exactly similar circumstances (para.16).

The Act was enacted for settlement of collective disputes between employers and workmen. The enactment of Section 2-A destroys the concept of an industrial dispute as a collective dispute. The provisions of Section 2-A do not fit into the general texture of the Act. (Para. 18).

A right to form Trade Union Association even by employers is guaranteed by Article 19 (1) (c) of the Constitution. Any law which is inconsistent (as Section 2-A is) with that fundamental right is to that extent rendered void by Article 13. Thus so far as collective disputes are concerned the powers under Section 10 are valid; but those powers are invalid in relation to an industrial dispute deemed to be an industrial dispute within Section 2-A. Consequently Section 2-A which is severable from Section 10 is void and as such inoperative in law, in spite of Section 10 being valid for collective disputes being referred to adjudication under Section 10. (Para.18)."

17. The above mentioned ruling supports the company's contention that Sections 2-A of the I.D. Act, 1947 is void and in law as it offends the provisions of Article 14 of the Constitution. There is however, the ruling of High Court of Mysore in the case between P. Janardhana Shetty and Union of India and others, reported in 1970, II, L.J., page 738, which has taken a contrary view. This ruling is as follows:—

"In the instant case the employees whose services were terminated preferred appeals to the Commissioner of Labour under S. 39 of the Mysore Shops and Establishment Act. After S. 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 came into force on 1-12-1965 the Labour Commissioner directed the employees to have recourse to the remedy provided under the Industrial Disputes Act.

The employees filed petition before the Commissioner for Labour withdrawing the appeals, pursuant to which the Commissioner for Labour directed the Labour Officer to conciliate the dispute relating to such employee's termination. The Labour Officer consequently initiated conciliation proceedings by issuing notices to the employer and the employee. In the instant writ petition preferred by employee against such notices issued by the Conciliation Officer, it was contended on this behalf that S. 2A should be struck down as being violative of Art. 14 of the Constitution of India and its enactment was beyond the powers of the legislature. It was further contended that as the dispute relating to discharge, dismissal retrenchment or termination having taken place in the instant case prior to 1-12-1965 S. 2A had no application and the Commissioner of Labour had no jurisdiction to direct the Labour Officer to conciliate the dispute and the Labour Commissioner should have disposed of the appeals under S.39 of the Shops and Establishments Act.

Negating the contention that S. 2A was ultra vires of the Act and it was violative of Art. 14 of the Constitution of India, it was held that S. 2A could not be said to be inconsistent and repugnant to the object of the Act. When a subsequent Act amends the earlier Act in such a way as to incorporate itself or as part of itself, into the earlier Act, then the earlier Act must thereafter be read and construed as if the altered words had been written into the earlier Act with pen and the old words scored out so that thereafter there is no need to refer the amending Act at all. The words 'industrial dispute' occurring in the preamble of the Act, are wide enough to cover dispute between an employee and single employee and as such individual dispute relating to discharge, dismissal or retrenchment could not be construed to be outside the scope of the Industrial Disputes Act, as the legislature was competent to introduce S. 2A under Entry 22 in list III to Schedule 7 of the Constitution of India. The said entry is wide enough to include industrial and labour dispute between an individual employee and his employer.

It was further held that the said S. 2A did not offend, Art-14 of the Constitution of India, as there is an intelligible differentia which distinguishes an individual workman who is discharged, dismissed, retrenched or whose services have been terminated and individual workman who has some other grievance in regard to his employment or conditions thereof and as the discharge, dismissal or retrenchment or termination of services of a workman is of graver consequence to a workman than any other grievance regard to other terms or conditions of employment. By enabling the individual workman to raise a dispute in regard to his discharge, dismissal or retrenchment, his cause need not bank upon the support of fellow workers as it was prior to the coming into force of S.2A and thus the object for which S.2A was introduced has been achieved. So long as discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination of services is of greater degree of grievous consequence to an individual workman than any other

grievance in regard to his employment or conditions thereof, it is open to the Legislature to provide for a special remedy in regard to a workman who is discharged, dismissed, retrenched or whose services are terminated, while such remedy may not be provided for a workman whose grievance is of lesser gravity."

18. In the present case Shri Sinha has not pointed out any ruling of the Bombay High Court or of the Supreme Court in support of his contention that Section 2A is void and illegal as it offends the provisions of Article 14 of the Constitution. In the absence of specific ruling by the Supreme Court by the Bombay High Court, I rely on the ruling of the High Court of Mysore, which has taken a view that Section 2A is not void. If Section 2A is not void and illegal, the dispute raised by single workman would be deemed to be an industrial dispute though it is not espoused by other workmen or any union of workmen.

19. Shri Sinha contends that this reference is bad in law because other employees have not espoused Shri Dinker's cause and because this is a case by an individual. He further contends that the Government should have made this reference under Section 2A and not in the way it is made.

20. Shri Sinha relies on the ruling of the Supreme Court in the case between Central Provinces Transport Services Ltd. and Raghunath Copal Patwardhan, reported in 1957, 1, L.J. page 27. This ruling lays down as follows:—

"The preponderance of Judicial opinion is clearly in favour of the view that a dispute between an employer and a single employee cannot per se be an "industrial dispute" within the meaning of S. 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, but it might become one if this taken up by the union or a number of workmen.

Notwithstanding that the language of S. 2(k) is wide enough to cover a dispute between an employer and a single employee, the scheme of the Industrial Disputes Act does appear to contemplate that the machinery provided therein should be set in motion, to settle only disputes which involve the rights of workmen as a class and that a dispute touching the individual rights of a workman was not intended to be the object of an adjudication under the Act, when the same has not been taken up by the union or a number of workmen."

21. There would have been much force in the argument of Shri Sinha that the present dispute between the company and Shri Dinker cannot be an industrial dispute within the meaning of S. 2(k) of the I.D. Act, 1947 as it is not taken up by the union or a number of workmen and because it is raised by an individual, if the amended Section 2A would not have been on the statute. The ruling relied upon by him and referred to above is of the year prior to the amendment. Since amended Section 2A came into force, it is clear that when any employer discharges, dismisses, retrenches or otherwise terminates the services of an individual workman, any dispute or difference between that workman and his employer connected with or arising out of, such discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination shall be deemed to be an industrial dispute notwithstanding that no other workmen nor any union of workmen is a party to the dispute. The present dispute on account of the termination of the services of Shri Dinker is an industrial dispute under Section 2A of the I.D. Act, 1947.

22. Shri Sinha contends that the Central Government has not made the present reference under Section 2A of the I.D. Act and the way in which it has made the reference shows that there is dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Chowgule and Company Private Limited and their workmen. Admittedly the dispute has not been espoused, by other workmen or any union of workmen. The dispute has been raised only by Shri Dinker. The reference made by the Government would not become bad simply because it is mentioned in it that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Chowgule and Company

Private Limited and their workmen. One has to take into consideration the intention and substance and not the mere grammatical words. If we look into the record and facts the circumstances of the case, there can be no doubt that the dispute is between the company and a single workman. Hence I am of the view that the present dispute is under Section 2A though it mentions in the order that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Chowgule and Company Pvt. Ltd., and their workmen. The expression 'workmen' includes 'workman'. Hence the contention raised by Shri Sinha cannot be accepted.

23. Shri Sinha for the company contends that the reference made by the Government to this Tribunal is bad in law because there is no dispute between the company and Shri Dinker as he had not raised any dispute with the company demanding his reinstatement, and because he raised the dispute for the first time with the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-de-Gama only. In support of this contention he relies on the ruling of the Supreme Court in the case between Sindhu Resettlement Corporation Ltd. and Industrial Tribunal, Gujarat and others reported in 1968, 1, L.J. page 834.

24. It appears that Shri Dinker wrote a letter to the company on 14-6-1971 after his services were terminated on 12-6-1971, by the Director by his letter dated 12-6-1971. Letter dated 14-6-1971 addressed to the Director is as follows:—

"Mr. Director/M. Director,
Chowgule & Co. Pvt. Ltd.,

Respected Sir,

Alongwith this letter I have attached an enclosure which I presume is self explanatory as to the reasons as to why my services with the company were an eyesore to many in the higher classes of officers. If you kindly grant me an interview at an early date, I in person can throw more light with sufficient proof which if taken note of may save quite a good amount of money which is going through the drain at present.

I still believe may I am sure, I am victimised not for any faults or blunders committed by me but for reasons that I am in the know of and wanted to check the malpractices practised by my then higher officers.

I request you earnestly not to view this letter as an afterthought but a reality which is prevailing at present to defraud the company's finances unnoticed.

"Thanking you and awaiting an appointment to prove my innocence."

25. It appears from the above mentioned letter that Shri Dinker did not raise any demand on the company demanding that he should be reinstated setting aside his illegal termination. What he wants to convey to the Director is that he should given interview for bringing to this notice the various malpractices practised by the higher officers in the company.

26. After writing this letter he raised a demand regarding his reinstatement by making application to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-de-Gama on 20-6-1971. That application is as follows:—

"Sub:—Termination of service.

I, U. Dinker, worked in the capacity of Head Store Keeper from 13th January 1967 till 12th June, 1971 in the Pale Mines of M/s Chowgule & Co. Pvt. Ltd., Mormugao Harbour.

All of a sudden my services were terminated by M/s Chowgule & Co. Pvt. Ltd by their letter of 12th June, 1971 on the pretext that one months notices or payment of salary in lieu of notice will

be necessary on either side for terminating the appointment."

The recourse to this clause in the appointment letter is done with malafide intention. The malpractices practised by certain officers were known to me and hence before they were brought to notice of company my services were terminated. I was never warned for any blunders committed by me.

I request that I should be reinstated from the date of my alleged termination and illegal cut of Rs. 50 p.m. in my monthly pay packet, which was affected since April, May, 1970 instant any notice, be restored in the retrospective effect.

I have already dispatched letter to the Director and Managing Director of the company by Registered Post on the 14th June, 1971.

Thanking you."

27. It is clear from the above mentioned application that he specifically requested the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Vasco-de-Gama to reinstate him from the date of his alleged termination. He never made such specific demand for reinstatement with the company before raising the same demand with the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Vasco-de-Gama. It means that he raised the demand for reinstatement for the first time before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) and not with the company. As the dispute challenging the termination of his service and demanding reinstatement was not raised with the company it cannot become an industrial dispute.

28. The present reference has been made by the Government under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Section 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 is as follows:—

"Where the appropriate Government is of opinion that any industrial dispute exists or is apprehended it may at any time, by order in writing refer the dispute or any matter appearing to be connected with or relevant to the dispute, whether it relates to any matter specified in the Second Schedule or the Third Schedule to a Tribunal for adjudication."

29. As per Section 10 (1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 the appropriate Government can refer the dispute to this Tribunal if it is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists. In the present case the demand for reinstatement challenging the termination of service of Shri U. Dinker was not taken up with the company. Hence it is not an industrial dispute. As it is not an industrial dispute this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain the same.

30. In the case between Sindhu Resettlement Corporation Ltd. and Industrial Tribunal, Gujarat and other, reported in 1968. I. L.J., page 834, their lordships of the Supreme Court have held as follows:—

"On the facts of this case it is clear that the reference made by the Government was not competent. A mere demand to a Government without a dispute being raised by the workmen with their employer cannot become an industrial dispute..."

31. In view of this Supreme Court ruling, it is clear that the present reference is not competent as it was not raised by the workman with his employer.

32. When the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain the reference, the tribunal cannot decide other contentions raised by the parties. It cannot also make any observations regarding various other places and contentions raised in their written statements.

33. Shri Sinha contends that Shri U. Dinker is not a workman within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947 because he was appointed for doing supervisory duty and because his pay was more than Rs. 500/- per mensem. Shri Dinker on the other hand contends that he

was mainly doing the clerical work and that he was not doing supervisory work. What he wants to say is that he is a workman within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

34. It is contended on behalf of the workman that the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Vasco-de-Gama has already considered this contention and held that he is a workman under Section 2(s) of the Act by his letter dated 14-9-1971.

35. It is clear from the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Vasco-de-Gama's letter dated 14-9-1971 that he has held that Shri U. Dinker is a workman under Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947 and he is competent to raise an industrial dispute under Section 2A of the I.D. Act, 1947 in respect of termination of his service.

36. As the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Vasco-de-Gama could not settle the dispute he submitted his failure of conciliation report to the Government. On account of this the Government made this reference for adjudication. The Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Vasco-de-Gama's finding that Shri U. Dinker is a workman under Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has to be considered by this Tribunal on material before me. Finding given by the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Vasco-de-Gama will not prevent the company, from raising the same contention before me. This contention is not barred by resjudicate.

37. As this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain this dispute, it is not necessary to give finding in this respect or in respect of merit. Even if it is assumed for the sake of argument that Shri U. Dinker is a workman within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947, and that he was mainly doing the clerical work, yet this reference would not be tenable because Shri Dinker had not raised the demand for his reinstatement before the company first, and because on account of this there is no industrial dispute which the Government can refer to this Tribunal.

38. In short, relying on the Supreme Court ruling referred to above I hold that mere demand to a Government without a dispute being raised by the workman with his employer cannot become an industrial dispute and that on account of this Tribunal has not jurisdiction to entertain the present reference. Hence my finding on point Nos. i by resjudicata.

Point No. iii

39. In view of the above findings this reference fails. In the end I pass the following order.

ORDER

(i) It is hereby declined that this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain this reference.

(ii) Reference is dismissed.

(iii) Award is made accordingly.

(iv) No order as to costs.

N. K. VANI, Presiding Officer
[No. L-29012/32/71-LR. IV]
S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 10 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2056.—यसतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायध्व अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में भारत का खाद्य निगम, मॉन्ग्रास बंदरगाह (गोवा) के श्री आर. बी. रॉड्रिज, ठेकेदार से संबंध नियोजकों और श्री वसंत बी. मण्डेकर के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है।

और यतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मुम्बई के न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मोरमुगव बंदरगाह स्थित भारत का खाद्य निगम के ठेकेदार श्री आर. वी. रेडिज, नियोजक की श्री वसंत वी. गन्ड्रेकर को, जुलाई, 1969 में आर्ध-वेतन-छुट्टी से उनके लौटने के पश्चात्, नियोजन न देने की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है ?

यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?

[सं. एल-36012/2/72-पी एड डी]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th July, 1973

S.O. 2056.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to Shri R. V. Redij, Contractor to Food Corporation of India, Mormugao Harbour (Goa) and Shri Vasant V. Mandrekar, in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, constituted under Section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the employer, Shri R. V. Redij, Food Corporation of India's Contractor, at Mormugao Harbour, is not offering employment to the workmen, Shri Vasant V. Mandrekar, after his return from half pay leave in July, 1969, is justified?”

If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

[No. L-36012/2/72-P&D.]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 1973

का० आ० 2057.—यह बम्बई पोर्ट ट्रस्ट, बम्बई, बम्बई स्टेवेडोर्स एसोसिएशन लिमिटेड और निर्माण एण्ड पैटिंग इम्प्लायर्स एसोसिएशन (पी०) लिमिटेड, बम्बई के प्रवक्ताओं से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व ट्रान्स्पोर्ट एण्ड डाक वर्क्स यूनियन, वी० पी० टी० इम्प्लायीज यूनियन वी० पी० टी० जनरल वर्कर्स यूनियन और वी० पी० टी० रेलवेमेन्स यूनियन, बम्बई करती है, एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है,

और यह उक्त नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों से औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (1) के अधीन एक लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को माध्यस्थ के लिए निर्देशित करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त माध्यस्थ करार की

एक प्रति उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के अति केन्द्रीय सरकार को भेजी गई है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त माध्यस्थ करार को एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करती है।

औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947

की धारा 10-क अधीन करार

के बीच

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले:

1. बम्बई पोर्ट ट्रस्ट, बम्बई
2. बम्बई स्टेवेडोर्स एसोसिएशन लि०, बम्बई।
3. निर्माण एण्ड पैटिंग इम्प्लायर्स एसोसिएशन पी० लि०, बम्बई।

कर्मचारियों का प्रतिनिधित्व करनेवाले:

1. ट्रान्स्पोर्ट एण्ड डाक वर्क्स यूनियन, बम्बई।
2. वी० पी० टी० इम्प्लायीज यूनियन बम्बई।
3. वी० पी० टी० जनरल वर्कर्स यूनियन, बम्बई।
4. वी० पी० टी० रेलवेमेन्स यूनियन, बम्बई।

पक्षकारों के बीच निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद को श्री ए० टी० जामने, पीठासीन अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय सभा 2, चौथी मंजिल, सीटी आर्डीस बिल्डिंग 298, बाजार गेट, स्ट्रीट, फोर्ट, बम्बई के माध्यस्थ के लिए निर्देशित करने का एतद्वारा करार किया गया है।

(i) विनिश्चित विवाद अस्त विषय: पत्तन और गोदी श्रमिकों संबंधी केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट और उस पर तथा अन्य संबंधित मामलों पर किये गये सरकार के निर्णयों, और अखिल भारतीय पत्तन तथा गोदी श्रमिक फेडरेशन द्वारा उठाई गई मांगों और उन पर किये गये और विचार विमर्श के सन्दर्भ में मुख्य पत्तनों के पत्तन और गोदी श्रमिकों से संबंधित निम्नलिखित विवाद अस्त मामलों को औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन माध्यस्थ के लिये गुण-बोध के आधार पर निर्णयार्थ निर्देशित किये जाने का करार किया गया है—

- (1) क्या महापता प्राप्त औद्योगिक श्रामिक योजना से अथवा महापता के तत्त्व और अनुसंगी कारणों को ध्यान में रखते हुए सरकार द्वारा प्रस्तावित मानक मकानों के किराये की वसूली की दरों को अर्थात् जहां मूल वेतन 200 रुपये प्रति माह से कम है वहां मूल वेतन का (परन्तु नगर प्रतिकार भत्ते का नहीं) 7½% और जहां वह 200 रुपये प्रति मास या उससे अधिक है, वहां मूल वेतन का (परन्तु नगर प्रतिकार भत्ते का नहीं) 10% की दर से, घटाया जाना चाहिये और यदि हां तो किस सादा तक,
- (2) क्या मुख्य पत्तनों के पत्तन और गोदी श्रमिकों संबंधी केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट के आधार पर सरकार द्वारा स्वीकृत किये गये संशोधन वेतनमानों में वेतन के

निर्धारण के मामले में मजदूरी बोर्ड की सिफारिश के अनुसार सरकार द्वारा मंजूर की गई रु० 11.80 प्रति घण्टी की अन्तरिम मज्हायता या उसके भाग को ध्यान में रखा जाना चाहिये।

(3) क्या मकान किराया भत्ते और प्रतिकर भत्ते के प्रयोजन के लिए महंगाई भत्ते (अतिरिक्त महंगाई भत्ते और समय-समय पर महंगाई भत्ते में की गई वृद्धि सहित) को अंशतः या पूर्णतः वेतन के रूप में माना जाना चाहिये।

(ii) विवाद के पक्षकारों का विवरण, जिसमें अन्तर्बलित स्थापन या उपक्रम का नाम और पता भी सम्मिलित है:

1. बम्बई पोर्ट ट्रस्ट,
शूरजी बलभवास मार्ग,
पोर्ट बम्बई-400001.
2. बम्बई स्टेवेटोर्स एसोसिएशन लिमिटेड
जन्म-भूमी चैम्बर्स फोर्ट, स्ट्रीट,
बम्बई-400001.
3. चिपिंग एण्ड पेटिंग इम्प्लायर्स एसोसिएशन पी० लि०,
जन्म भूमी चैम्बर्स तीसरी मंजिल
फोर्ट स्ट्रीट,
बम्बई 400001.
4. ट्रांसपोर्ट एण्ड डाकवर्क यूनियन,
पी० डि' मेल्को भवन,
पी० डी मिल्लो रोड,
कार्नाक बन्दर,
बम्बई-400001.
5. बी० पी० टी० इम्प्लायीज यूनियन,
कामगर भवन,
नशाब टैंक ओवरब्रिज, मजगाव,
बम्बई-400010.
6. बी० पी० टी० जनरल वर्कर्स यूनियन
कावाराना बिल्डिंग,
पी० डि मिल्लो रोड,
बम्बई-400009.
7. बी० पी० टी० रेलवेमेन्स यूनियन,
कालाचौकी-मेवरी रोड,
बम्बई-400033.

(iii) यूनियनों के नाम
जैसा उपर (ii) के अन्तर्गत 4 से 7 में।

(iv) प्रभावित उपक्रम में नियोजित कर्मकारों की कुल संख्या
बम्बई पोर्ट ट्रस्ट 29,800 (लगभग)

बम्बई स्टेवेटोर्स एसोसिएशन लि०	
चिपिंग एण्ड पेटिंग इम्प्लायर्स एसोसिएशन	
पी० लिमिटेड	9,000 (लगभग)
योग	38,800 (लगभग)

(v) विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित या संभावित:	
प्रभावित होने वाले कर्मकारों की प्राकलित संख्या	
बम्बई पोर्ट ट्रस्ट	29,800
बम्बई स्टेवेटोर्स एसोसिएशन लिमिटेड,	
चिपिंग एण्ड पेटिंग इम्प्लायर्स एसोसिएशन	
पी० लिमिटेड	6,000
योग	35,800

यदि माध्यस्थता अपना पंचाट अपनी नियुक्ति से तीन महीने की अवधि के भीतर देने में समर्थ नहीं होता तो वह राहत के रूप में अंतरिम सिफारिश करने के लिए स्वतंत्र होगा।

पक्षकारों के हस्ताक्षर

दिनांक 20 जून 1973

ह०—सचिव

नियोजक का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले

1. सचिव, बम्बई पोर्ट ट्रस्ट, बम्बई।
ह०—अपाठ्य

2. अध्यक्ष,
बम्बई स्टेवेटोर्स एसोसिएशन लि०
बम्बई स्टेवेटोर्स एसोसिएशन लि०
बम्बई।

ह०—अपाठ्य

3. अध्यक्ष,
चिपिंग एण्ड पेटिंग इम्प्लायर्स
एसोसिएशन पी० लिमिटेड, बम्बई

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले

1. ह०-अपाठ्य
सचिव,
ट्रांसपोर्ट एण्ड डाक वर्कर्स यूनियन,
बम्बई।

2. ह०-अपाठ्य
महासचिव,
बी० पी० टी० इम्प्लायीज यूनियन,
बम्बई।

3. ह०-अपाठ्य
महासचिव,
बी० पी० टी० जनरल वर्कर्स यूनियन
बम्बई।

4. ह०-अपाठ्य
महा सचिव,
बी० पी० टी० रेलवेमेन्स यूनियन,
बम्बई।

साक्षी: (1) ह०-अपाठ्य

ग्राल इण्डिया पोर्ट एण्ड वर्कर्स फेडरेशन से।

(2) ह०-अपाठ्य

[संख्या एल-39013/1/73-पी० एण्ड डी (5)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 11th July, 1973

S.O. 2057.—WHEREAS an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Bombay Port Trust, Bombay, Bombay Stevedores Association Limited and Chipping and Painting Employers Association Private Limited, Bombay and their workmen as represented by Transport and Dock Workers Union, B.P.T. Employees' Union, B.P.T.

General Workers Union and B.P.T. Railwaymen's Union Bombay;

AND, WHEREAS, the said employers and their workmen have by a written agreement under sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration and have forwarded to the Central Government, under sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act, a copy of the said arbitration agreement;

NOW, THEREFORE, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said agreement.

AGREEMENT UNDER SECTION 10A OF THE
INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947
between

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Representing employers: | 1. Bombay Port Trust, Bombay. |
| | 2. Bombay Stevedores' Association Ltd., Bombay. |
| | 3. Chipping & Painting Employers' Association P. Ltd., Bombay. |
| Representing workmen: | 1. Transport & Dock Workers' Union, Bombay. |
| | 2. B.P.T. Employees' Union, Bombay |
| | 3. B.P.T. General Workers' Union, Bombay. |
| | 4. B.P.T. Railwaymen's Union, Bombay. |

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following industrial dispute to the arbitration of Shri A. T. Zambre, Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, 4th Floor, City Ice Building, 298, Bazargate Street, Fort, Bombay.

(i) **Specific matters in dispute.**—In the context of the report of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers, the decisions of the Government thereon and other related matters, the demands raised by the All India Port and Dock Workers' Federation and the further discussions held on these, the following matters in dispute relating to Port and Dock Workers of the Major Ports are agreed to be referred to arbitration

under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for decision on merits:—

- (1) Whether, and, if so, to what extent, the rates for recovery of rent for standard houses proposed by Government, namely, $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ of basic pay (and not City Compensatory allowance), where basic pay is less than Rs. 200 per mensem, and at the rate of 10% of basic pay (and not City Compensatory Allowance) if it is Rs. 200 per mensem or more, should be reduced taking into account the subsidy element in the Subsidised Industrial Housing Scheme and other relevant factors.
- (2) Whether in the matter of fixation of pay in the revised scales accepted by the Government on the basis of the Central Wage Board Report for Port and Dock Workers at Major Ports, the interim relief of Rs. 11.80 per mensem or part thereof granted by Government as recommended by the Wage Board should be taken into account.
- (3) Whether Dearness Allowance (including additional Dearness Allowance and increases in Dearness Allowance from time to time) in part or full should be treated as pay for the purpose of House Rent Allowance and City Compensatory Allowance.

(ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the names and addresses of the establishments or undertakings involved:

1. Bombay Port Trust,
Shoorji Vallabhdas Marg, Fort,
Bombay-400001.
2. Bombay Stevedores' Association Ltd.,
Janmabhoomi Chambers, Fort Street,
Bombay-400001.
3. Chipping and Painting Employers' Association P. Ltd.,
Janmabhoomi Chambers, 3rd Floor,
Fort Street,
Bombay-400001.
4. Transport and Dock Workers' Union,
P. D'Mello Bhavan, P. D'Mello Road,
Carnac Bunder,
Bombay-400001.
5. B.P.T. Employees' Union,
Kamgar Sadan,
Nawab Tank Overbridge, Mazgaon,
Bombay-400010.
6. B.P.T. General Workers' Union,
Kavarana Building,
P. D'Mello Road,
Bombay-400009.
7. B.P.T. Railwaymen's Union,
Kalachowkey-Sewree Road,
Bombay-400033

(iii) Name of the Unions:
As at 4 to 7 under (ii) above.

(iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected:

Bombay Port Trust . . . 29,800 (Approximately)

Bombay Stevedores' Association Ltd. . . 9,000 Do.

Chipping & Painting Employers' Association P. Ltd.

TOTAL . . . 38,800 Do.

(v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute:

Bombay Port Trust . . . 29,800

Bombay Stevedores' Association Ltd.

Chipping & Painting Employers' Association P. Ltd. . . 6,000

TOTAL . . . 35,800

If the arbitrator is not able to give his award within a period of three months from the date of his appointment, he will be free to make interim recommendations by way of relief.
DATED THE 20TH DAY OF JUNE, 1973

Signature of the parties
Sd./-

SECRETARY

Representing employers: 1. Bombay Port Trust, Bombay

2. Sd./-

PRESIDENT,

Bombay Stevedores' Association Ltd., Bombay

3. Sd./-

CHAIRMAN,

Chipping and Painting Employers' Association P. Ltd., Bombay

Representing workmen: 1. Sd./-
SECRETARY,
Transport and Dock Workers Union, Bombay

2. Sd./-

GENERAL SECRETARY

B.P.T. Employees' Union, Bombay

3. Sd./-

GENERAL SECRETARY

B.P.T. General Workers' Union, Bombay

4. Sd./-
GENERAL SECRETARY
B.P.T. Railwaymen's Union,
Bombay

Witnesses

(1) Signed S. R. KULKARNI
from
All India Port and Dock
Workers Federation,

(2) Signed (Illegible)

[No. L-39013/1/73-P&D(v)]

का. आ. 2058.—यतः बम्बई पोर्ट ट्रस्ट, बम्बई, बम्बई स्टीवीडोर्स एसोसिएशन लि. और चिपिंग एण्ड पेंटिंग एम्प्लोयर्स एसोसिएशन (प्रा.) लि., बम्बई के प्रबंधन से संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व ट्रान्सपोर्ट एण्ड डॉक वर्कर्स यूनियन, बी. पी. टी. एम्पलाइज यूनियन, बी. पी. टी. जनरल वर्कर्स यूनियन एवं बी. पी. टी. रेलवेमैनस् यूनियन, बम्बई करती हैं, एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः उक्त नियोजक और उक्त यूनियन ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (1) के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में एक लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को वर्णित व्यक्ति के माध्यस्थता के लिए निवेशित करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त माध्यस्थता करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार को भेजी गई है ; और उसे उक्त धारा की उपधारा (3) के उपबंधों के अन्तर्गत भारत के राजपत्र के भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (2), दिनांक 11 जुलाई, 1973 में प्रकाशित, भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वसन मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) के आदेश संख्या एल-39013/1/73-पी. एंड डी.(6), दिनांक 21-7-73 के साथ प्रकाशित किया गया है ।

अब, यतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त निर्देश करने वाले व्यक्ति पक्ष के बहुमत का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद (केन्द्रीय नियम), 1957 के नियम 8-क के साथ पठित उक्त धारा की उपधारा (3क) के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उन नियोजकों और श्रमिकों के लिए जो उक्त माध्यस्थता करार के पक्षकर नहीं हैं, परन्तु जिनका विवाद से संबंध है, एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है कि उक्त निर्देश करने वाले व्यक्ति प्रत्येक पक्ष के बहुमत का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं ।

[संख्या एल-39013/1/73-पी. एंड डी. (6)]

टी. एस. कृष्णामूर्ति, अवर सचिव

S.O. 2058.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Bombay Port Trust, Bombay, Bombay Stevedores Association Limited,

and Chipping and Painting Employers' Association (P) Limited, Bombay and their workmen as represented by Transport and Dock Workers Union, B.P.T. Employees' Union, B.P.T. General Workers' Union and B.P.T. Railwaymen's Union, Bombay;

And, whereas, the said employers and the said unions have, by a written agreement in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration of the person mentioned therein, and a copy of the said arbitration agreement has been forwarded to the Central Government and the same has been published, under the provisions of sub-section (3) of the said section with the order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. L-39013/1/73-P&D(v), dated 11-7-1973, published in Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 21st July, 1973

And, whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the persons making the said reference represent the majority of the party;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (3A) of the said section, read with rule 8A of the Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957, the Central Government hereby notifies for the information of the employers and workmen who are not parties to the said arbitration agreement but who are concerned with the said dispute, that the persons making the said reference represented the majority of each party.

[No. L-39013/1/73-P&D(vi)]

T. S. KRISHNAMURTHI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 1973

क्र. आ. 2059.—वैयक्तिक क्षति (आपात उपबंध) स्कीम, 1971 के खण्ड 2 के उपखण्ड (ग) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री पी. के. जैन, उपसचिव, रक्षा मंत्रालय को, रक्षा मंत्रालय के अधीन नियोजित या नियुक्त सिविलियन की बाबत, उक्त स्कीम के अधीन संदाय करने के लिए दावा अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. एस. 20013/1/73-फैक्ट्री]

New Delhi, the 9th July, 1973

S.O. 2059.—In exercise of powers conferred by sub clause (c) of clause 2 of the Personal Injuries (Emergency Provisions) Scheme, 1971, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. K. Jain Deputy Secretary, in the Ministry of Defence, as claims officer to make payments under the said Scheme, in respect of the civilians employed or engaged under the Ministry of Defence.

[No. S-20013/1/73-Fac.]

क्र. आ. 2060.—वैयक्तिक क्षति (प्रतिकर बीमा) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 37) की धारा 14 की उपधारा (1), धारा 15 की उपधारा (1), धारा 16, धारा 17 और धारा 18 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सर्वत्र अण्डमान और निकोबार द्वीपसमूह के संघ-शासित क्षेत्र में अण्डमान और निकोबार प्रशासन के श्रमायुक्त को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 14, 15, 16, 17 और 18 के अधीन शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए, एतद्वारा प्राधिकृत करती है।

[सं. एस-19025/27/72-फैक.]

के. डी. हाजेल, उप-सचिव

S.O. 2060.—In pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 14, sub-section (1) of section 15, sections 16, 17 and 18 of the Personal Injuries (Compensation Insurance) Act, 1963 (37 of 1963), the Central Government hereby authorises the Labour Commissioner, Andaman and Nicobar Administration to exercise the powers under sections 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 of the said Act throughout the Union territory of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

[No. S. 19025/27/72-Fac.]

K. D. HAJELA, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 12 जून, 1973

क्र. आ. 2061.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 38 के अनुसरण में कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम का 1972-73 का पुनरीक्षित प्राक्कलन और 1973-74 वर्ष का बजट प्राक्कलन, जैसा कि उक्त निगम ने अन्तिम रूप से स्वीकार किया है, सर्व-साधारण की जानकारी के लिए एतद्वारा प्रकाशित किया जाता है।

(यह 1972-73 का पुनरीक्षित प्राक्कलन और 1973-74 वर्ष का प्राक्कलन द्विज्ये)

कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम

1972-73 के वर्ष के लिये परिशोधित प्राक्कलन तथा

1973-74 के वर्ष के लिये बजट प्राक्कलन

स्थायी समिति तथा निगम ने अपनी 17 तथा 18 फरवरी 1972 की बैठकों में वर्ष 1972-73 के वित्तीय वर्ष के लिये कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम के सम्भावित आय तथा व्यय के बजट प्राक्कलनों का अनुमोदन कर दिया था। इनकी श्रम एवं रोजगार विभाग ने अपने पत्र संख्या जी. 20017(4)/72 एच आर्डी

दिनांक 24 अप्रैल, 1972 द्वारा बिना किसी परिवर्तन के स्वीकृति दे दी थी।

2. केन्द्रीय सरकार के द्वारा अनुमोदित बजट प्राक्कलनों के अन्तर्गत निम्नलिखित बातें हैं :—

- (1) विभिन्न क्षेत्रों में, जहाँ योजना पहले ही कार्यान्वित हो चुकी है, योजना चलाने के लिये आवश्यक कार्यवाही।

तथा

- (2) अन्य क्षेत्रों में योजना के विस्तार करने के लिये आवश्यक कार्यवाही।

3. जब 1972-73 के लिये बजट प्राक्कलन तैयार किये गये थे, तब यह पूर्वनिर्धारित लगाया गया था कि (1) योजना नये क्षेत्रों में विस्तारित हो जायेगी। (2) चिकित्सा सुविधा बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों के परिवारों के लिये विस्तारित की जायेगी जैसा कि परिशिष्ट 1 के कार्यक्रम विवरण में दर्शाया गया है तथा उसी तारीख से होगी, जो कि उसके कालम 3 और 5 में प्रत्येक मद के आगे दिखाई गई है। तथापि संबंधित राज्य सरकारों द्वारा पर्याप्त चिकित्सा व्यवस्था देने में होने वाली प्रशासकीय तथा अन्य कीटनाशियों के कारण, परिवारों के लिये चिकित्सा सुविधा विस्तारित करने के कार्यक्रम का संशोधन करना पड़ा। योजना का विस्तार वास्तव में उनमें से कुछ क्षेत्रों में उन तारीखों के काफी बाद में हुआ, जो तारीखों परीशिष्ट 1 के कालम 4 में दिये गये विवरण में मूलतः दी गई थी। जहाँ तक उन क्षेत्रों का सम्बन्ध है जहाँ योजना का कार्यान्वयन अभी तक नहीं हुआ है वहाँ उपरोक्त विवरण के उपयुक्त कालमों में प्रत्येक मद के आगे, योजना के कार्यान्वयन की परिशीलित तारीख जो कि अब प्रत्याशित की गई है दे दी गई है। जिन तारीखों से परिवारों का चिकित्सा सुविधा दी गई है या दी जाने की सम्भावना है वे भी उसी प्रकार से परीशिष्ट-1 के कालम 6 में निर्दिष्ट की गई हैं।

4. विभिन्न राज्य सरकारों के साथ आगे और विचार विमर्श तथा पत्र व्यवहार के परिणामस्वरूप अब यह प्रत्याशा की जाती है कि नये क्षेत्रों में योजना 1972-73 तथा 1973-74 के वित्तीय वर्ष में परीशिष्ट-2 में दिखाई गई तारीखों से कार्यान्वित की जायेगी। सुविधा की दृष्टि से इस परीशिष्ट में उन स्थानों का भी ले लिया गया है जहाँ योजना पहले ही कार्यान्वयन की तारीख से ही कार्यान्वित हो चुकी है। नवीनतम प्राप्त सूचना के आधार पर उन कर्मचारियों की संख्या के परिशीलित करके परीशिष्ट-2 में समीक्षित कर लिया गया है जो अब तक योजनान्तर्गत आ गये हैं या आने के लिये प्रस्तावित हैं। इस परीशिष्ट में प्रत्येक मद के आगे वे तारीखें भी अंकित हैं जिन तारीखों से बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों के परिवारों के लिये चिकित्सा सुविधा विस्तारित की गई है या विस्तारित की जाने की सम्भावना है।

5. केवल कुछ संशोधनों को छोड़कर जोकि अनपेक्षित कारणों से होने वाले विलम्ब को ध्यान में रखते हुए किये गये हैं, 1972-73 के वित्तीय वर्ष के लिये परिशीलित प्राक्कलनों तथा वर्ष 1973-74 के लिये बजट प्राक्कलनों का, कार्यान्वयन के परिशीलित कार्यक्रम के अनुसार तैयार किया गया है। सारणीबद्ध बजट विवरण ए-1 और ए-2 के सम्बन्धित कालमों में 1969-70 से 1971-72 तक के तीन वित्तीय वर्षों के वास्तविक आय व व्यय के आंकड़े तथा 1972-73 के चालू वित्तीय वर्ष के लिये संस्वीकृत बजट प्राक्कलन एवं 1972-73 के चालू वर्ष के प्रथम आठ महीनों के वास्तविक आंकड़े भी दिखाये गये हैं। ये विचार तथा अनुमोदन के लिये प्रस्तुत किये गये हैं।

6. विवरण ए-1 और ए-2 के कालम 9 में 1972-73 के परिशीलित प्राक्कलनों के आंकड़े तथा कालम 10 में 1973-74 के बजट प्राक्कलनों के आंकड़े दिखाये गये हैं।

7. (अ) नीचे दिये हुए पैराओं में, विभिन्न शीर्षों के अन्तर्गत जो अधिक महत्वपूर्ण मद हैं उनकी संक्षिप्त व्याख्या दी गई है। 31 मार्च, 1973 को समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष की आय तथा व्यय लेखा तुलनपत्र के साथ जैसा कि वह उस तारीख को था तथा 31 मार्च 1974 को समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष का आय व व्यय लेखा उसके तुलनपत्र के साथ जैसा कि वह उस तारीख को होगा, व्यय रोपण किया गया है, यह क्रमशः 1972-73 के परिशीलित प्राक्कलनों तथा 1973-74 के बजट प्राक्कलनों के प्रत्याशित आने वाले तथा जाने वाले आंकड़ों पर आधारित हैं। अवलोकन की सुविधा की दृष्टि से ये राशियाँ संलग्न हैं। इसके अतिरिक्त निम्नलिखित विवरण भी संलग्न हैं :—

वास्तविक आंकड़े :

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 1. वर्ष 1969-70 का क्षेत्रवार आय व व्यय दर्शाते हुए विवरण | परीशिष्ट-3 |
| 2. वर्ष 1970-71 का क्षेत्रवार आय व व्यय दर्शाते हुए विवरण | परीशिष्ट-4 |
| 3. वर्ष 1971-72 का क्षेत्रवार आय व व्यय दर्शाते हुए विवरण। | परीशिष्ट-5 |

बजट

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 4. वर्ष 1972-73 का क्षेत्रवार प्रत्याशित आय व व्यय दर्शाते हुए विवरण। | परीशिष्ट-6 |
| 5. वर्ष 1973-74 का क्षेत्रवार आंकलित आय व व्यय दर्शाते हुए विवरण। | परीशिष्ट-7 |

(ब) उपरोक्त विवरण के 'मुख्यालय' शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत दिखाये गये कार्य विवरण में, क्षेत्रीय व स्थानीय कार्यालयों में किये गये कुछ केन्द्रित मदों के खर्च भी व्यय में सम्मिलित हैं। उदाहरणार्थ

निगम के कर्मचारियों के भविष्य निधि व पेंशन आरक्षित निधि के लिये अंशदान निगम में प्रतिनियुक्त सरकारी कर्मचारियों को अदा होने वाले छुट्टी तथा पेंशन का अंशदान, प्रचारक, अंशदान, स्तंभों का खर्च तथा लेखा परीक्षा शुल्क आदि ऐसे कीन्तु मद्द हैं।

8. अंशदान

(अ) नियोजक विशेष अंशदान

नियोजक विशेष अंशदान नियोजक द्वारा योजना परिपालित क्षेत्रों में कुल वतन मिल का 4 प्रतिशत की दर से अपरिपालित क्षेत्रों में कुल वतन मिल का 3/4 प्रतिशत की दर से त्रैमासिक में अंशदान की अदायगी होनी है उसकी समाप्ति के 30 दिन के अन्दर देय है।

(ब) कर्मचारी अंशदान

कर्मचारी अंशदान सभी योजना परिपालित क्षेत्रों में नियत दर पर कर्मचारियों से पूरे साल का या उससे कम का, जोकि योजना के विस्तार को तारीख पर निर्भर है, वसूल किया जाता है।

9. चिकित्सा हितलाभ

(अ) 'अ-चिकित्सा हितलाभ' शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत व्यय, दिल्ली संघ राज्य को छोड़कर जहाँ पर कि योजना सीधे ही निगम द्वारा शासित है, राज्य सरकारों द्वारा प्रारम्भिक रूप से वहन किया जाता है और उसके पश्चात् निगम तथा राज्य सरकारों में नियत अनुपात 7 : 1 के हिसाब से बाँट लिया जाता है। इस शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत उपबन्ध निगम के अंश के लिये उचित प्रबन्ध के लिये है।

(ब) चिकित्सा हितलाभ पर खर्च में उच्चतम दर

1-4-1972 से चिकित्सा हितलाभ पर आपस में बाँटे जाने वाले खर्च की उच्चतम दर को प्रति कर्मचारी प्रति वर्ष निम्न दर पर परिशोधित कर दिया है :—

1. 50 रुपये से 56 रुपये तक उन क्षेत्रों में जहाँ चिकित्सा देख-रेख सीमित उपलब्ध है।
2. 54 रु. से 60 रु. तक उन क्षेत्रों में जहाँ विस्तृत चिकित्सा देख-रेख उपलब्ध है।
3. 64 रु. से 70 रु. तक उन क्षेत्रों में जहाँ पूर्ण चिकित्सा देख-रेख उपलब्ध है।

(स) राज्य सरकारों की अदायगियाँ

वर्ष के दौरान अग्रिम लेखा पर चिकित्सा हितलाभ पर निगम अपने अंश के व्यय का लगभग 90 प्रतिशत अदायगियाँ राज्य सरकारों से प्राप्त हुए व्यय-विवरण के आधार पर करती है जोकि राज्य महालेखाकारों से लेखा-परीक्षा प्रमाणपत्र में समायोजन के शर्त पर होता है। पिछली बार गत दायित्वों को चुकाने में चिकित्सा हितलाभों के कारण किया गया व्यय एक विशेष निधि से पूरा किया जा रहा था जोकि 1-4-70 से नियोजकों के विशेष अंशदानों में 0.5 प्रतिशत वृद्धि से बनाया गया था। 27-5-72 को हुई बैठक में स्थायी समिति ने विशेष निधि को केवल पूंजीगत निर्माण पर खर्च करने का निश्चय किया तथा गत दायित्वों के चिकित्सा हितलाभ

के कारण चुकाने के लिये, जोकि राजस्व लेखों में से अब नाम मात्र है, निश्चय किया। इस शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत बजट उपबंध तदनुसार किया गया है तथा चालू वर्ष तथा गत वर्षों के दायित्वों को चुकाने के लिये आवश्यक निधि को अवश्य दिखाया गया है।

(द) निगम द्वारा सीधे रूप से किया गया व्यय:—

'चिकित्सा उपचार तथा देख-रेख और मातृत्वसुविधा, (निगम के द्वारा प्रत्यक्ष रूप से वहन किये गये खर्च)' शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत जो उपबन्ध है उसमें दिल्ली के संघ शासित क्षेत्र के निमाकृत व्यक्तियों तथा परिवारों को चिकित्सा सुविधा (जो कि 1 अप्रैल, 1962 से निगम ने संभाल लिया) देने में प्रशासन व्यय की लागत का आकलन शामिल है। 1972-73 के परिशोधित प्राक्कलनों तथा 1973-74 के बजट प्राक्कलनों में 'चिकित्सा हितलाभ पर निगम द्वारा प्रारम्भिक रूप से वहन किये गये खर्च में राज्य सरकारों/संघ राज्यों के अंश' शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत राजस्व पक्ष में 1/8 भाग को दर से विभाज्य राशि तथा उच्चतम सीमा से अधिक व्यय की प्रत्याशित वसूली के खाते ले लिया गया है।

1972-73 के लिये परिशोधित प्राक्कलन

प्राप्ति

10(अ) 1972-73 के चालू वर्ष के लिये निगम के राजस्व का अब 6065.32 लाख रुपये का अनुमान है जो कि बजट में 5662.59 लाख रुपये था अर्थात् अब 402.73 लाख रुपये अधिक है।

10(ब) राजस्व में जो बढ़ावरी है उसमें अंशदानों में (211.97 लाख रुपये) तथा राजस्व के अन्य शीर्षों में (190.76 लाख रुपये) हैं।

10(स) ब्याज तथा लाभांश

अतिरिक्त बकाया राशि के विनियोजन पर प्राप्त ब्याज तथा लाभांश तथा कर्मचारियों को धाह्य आदि क्रयण व भयन निर्माण हेतु, स्वीकृत अग्रिमों पर ब्याज की राशि का 106.30 लाख रुपये का अनुमान है जबकि बजट प्राक्कलन में यह 40.32 लाख रुपये था।

इस अधिकता का मुख्य कारण वसूली, वितरण तथा विनियोजन के तरीकों में सुधार भी है जोकि 1-9-1971 से स्टेट बैंक आफ इण्डिया नई दिल्ली के साथ एक कीन्तु रूप से खाता खोलकर किया गया है जिसके द्वारा तुरन्त आवश्यकताओं से अधिक राशि का थोड़े समय के लिये विनियोजन करना सम्भव हो सकता है।

10(द) 129 लाख रुपये के वास्तविक आंकड़ों की अपेक्षा निगम को क. रा. बी. औषधालय तथा चिकित्सालय तथा उनके साथ बनाये हुए नियास संबंधी स्टाफ क्वार्टरों के किराये से प्राप्त आय अब 266 लाख रुपये तक पहुँच जाने की आशा है। वृद्धि का कारण अधिक भवनों का चालू होना है तथा पिछले सालों के बकाया किराये की वसूली है जोकि मानक किराये के निर्धारण के कारण रुक गई थी। इस प्रकार वसूल किया गया किराया निमाकृत व्यक्तियों के चिकित्सा हितलाभ पर राज्य सरकारों द्वारा किये गये व्यय का जोकि निगम व राज्य सरकारों में विभाज्य है, एक भाग बन जायेगा और इस प्रकार वह स्वभावतः ही निगम व राज्य सरकारों में 7 : 1 के अनुपात से सीधे-भाजित हो जायेगा।

व्यय

11. 1972-73 के चालू वर्ष में राजस्व लेखा पर व्यय की कुल राशि अब 4929.26 लाख रुपये अनुमानित की गई, जबकि बजट 5616.32 लाख रुपये रखी गई थी अर्थात् अब 687.06 लाख रुपये कम है।

12. शीर्ष-1-बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों तथा उनके परिवारों को लाभ

अ-बीमाकृत हितलाभ

पिछले पैंरा (स) के संदर्भ में विस्तृत इस शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत कुल व्यवस्था 2137.37 लाख रुपये की है जिसमें कि निगम के भाग के डाक्टरों इलाज आदि के तथा चिकित्सालयों के लिये उपकरण के व्यय के 1863.99 लाख रुपये, दिल्ली में चिकित्सा लाभ पर व्यय के 88.63 लाख रुपये जहाँ पर कि योजना सीधे तौर पर निगम द्वारा शासित है तथा महाराष्ट्र क्षेत्र में बीमाकृत स्त्रियों और बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों की स्त्रियों को प्रसव शुल्क के लिये दिये राशि के 11.70 लाख रुपये सम्मिलित हैं। दिल्ली में 1/8 भाग के व्यय तथा उत्तम सीमा से अधिक व्यय की वसूली को 1973-74 के बजट के आय पक्ष में ले लिया गया है, जबकि राशि के प्राप्त होने की संभावना है। महाराष्ट्र से 1/8 भाग की वसूली होनी है उसे चिकित्सा हितलाभ के व्यय के दावे की प्रतिपूर्ति के समय समायोजित कर लिया जाएगा।

13. ब - नकद लाभ तथा स - अन्य हितलाभ

नकद लाभों के अन्तर्गत परिशोधित उपबंध अब 1741.70 लाख रुपये पर स्थित है जोकि बजट स्तर पर 2639.17 लाख रु. का पूर्वानुमान लगाया गया। व्यय में कमी का मुख्य कारण बन्धन मुक्त प्रमाण-पत्रों को कम करने तथा पं. बंगाल क्षेत्र में कानून तथा व्यवस्था में सुधार लाने के लिये निगम द्वारा लिये गये प्रभावशाली प्रशासनिक उपायों से संबंधित है।

'स-अन्य हितलाभ' के अंतर्गत 12.22 लाख रुपये की राशि में राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा परिषद की दुर्घटना के उद्योगों में रोकने के लिये वर्ष 1972-73 में दी जाने वाली 5 लाख रुपये की राशि सहायता-अनुदान के रूप में सम्मिलित है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के द्वारा स्वीकृत किया गया था।

14. शीर्ष - 2 - प्रशासन व्यय

(अ) प्रशासनिक खर्चों पर वर्ष 1972-73 के अन्तर्गत 488.03 लाख रुपये के खर्च का अनुमान लगाया गया था जबकि बजट प्राक्कलन में यह 470.16 लाख रुपये था। वृद्धि का मुख्य कारण भत्ता व मानदेय तथा आकस्मिक व्यय के अन्तर्गत अधिक उपबंध से संबंधित है। भत्ता व मानदेय में वृद्धि 1-6-72 से निगम के कर्मचारियों को दिये जाने वाले अतिरिक्त 5 प्रतिशत मकान किराया भत्ता तथा 1-8-72 से निगम के कर्मचारियों को अन्तिम सहायता देने के कारण है जोकि केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने कर्मचारियों को स्वीकृत किया है।

(ब) प्रशासन व्यय के उपबन्ध 1972-73 के तात्. वर्ष के प्रथम आठ महीनों के वास्तविक आंकड़ों तथा बचे हुए चार महीनों की प्रत्याशित आवश्यकता के आधार पर तैयार किये गये हैं।

(स) परिशोधित प्राक्कलनों के अनुसार प्रति व्यक्ति प्रशासनिक व्यय 12.17 रुपये प्रति बीमाकृत कर्मचारी, प्रति वर्ष आयगा जबकि बजट के सगय यह आंकड़े 11.39 रुपये प्रत्याशित किये गये थे।

(व) 1972-73 के परिशोधित प्राक्कलन में प्रत्याशित प्रशासन व्यय कुल राजस्व का 9.90 प्रतिशत निकाला गया है जबकि 1971-72 में यह वास्तविक आंकड़ों के हिसाब से 8.30 प्रतिशत था।

15. पूंजी लेखा पर व्यय

स्थायी समिति ने 27-5-72 को हुई अपनी बैठक में विशेष निर्णय को, जोकि 1-4-70 से नियोजकों के विशेष अंशदानों में 0.5 प्रतिशत

की वृद्धि से बनाई गई थी, केवल भविष्य में पूंजीगत निर्माण पर हुए व्यय को पूरा करने के लिये उपयोग में लाने का निश्चय किया। पूंजी लेखा के लिये मूलतः 134.75 लाख रुपयों की राशि रखी गई थी, जिसमें (1) कार्यालय की इमारतों (स्टाफ क्वार्टरों सहित) के निर्माण पर 10 लाख रुपये। (2) चिकित्सालयों व औषधालयों के निर्माण के लिये 124 लाख रुपये तथा (3) स्टाफ कार के क्रय के लिये 0.75 लाख रुपये सन्निहित हैं।

1972-73 में परिशोधित प्राक्कलन की व्यवस्था 226.54 लाख रुपये निम्न प्रकार से की गई :-

(अ) कार्यालय इमारतें (स्टाफ क्वार्टर सहित)

1972-73 के बजट प्राक्कलन में दी गई 10 लाख रुपयों की व्यवस्था को 1972-73 के परिशोधित प्राक्कलनों में 16.44 लाख रुपये बढ़ा दिया गया है। यह वास्तविक आंकड़ों तथा प्रत्याशित अदायगी की प्रवृत्ति पर आधारित है।

(ब) चिकित्सालयों तथा औषधालयों की इमारतें

1972-73 के परिशोधित प्राक्कलन में इस शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत 124 लाख रुपयों की व्यवस्था को बढ़ाकर 208 लाख रुपये, वास्तविक आंकड़ों तथा प्रत्याशित अदायगी की प्रवृत्ति के आधार पर कर दिया गया है।

(स) स्टाफ कार

1972-73 के परिशोधित प्राक्कलन में स्टाफ कार के क्रय के लिये 1,50,000 रुपयों की व्यवस्था की गई है जबकि 1972-73 के बजट प्राक्कलन में यह 75,000 रु. थी।

16. राज्य सरकारों को उधार

स्थायी समिति ने अपनी 24 मई 1968 की बैठक में महाराष्ट्र सरकार को चिकित्सालयों के निर्माण के लिये 300 लाख रुपये का एक उधार संस्वीकृत किया था। केन्द्रीय सरकार के परामर्श से अब 234 लाख रुपये का ऋण चार वार्षिक किस्तों में देने का निर्णय किया गया था, जिसमें से प्रथम तीन किस्तों प्रत्येक 60 लाख रुपये की होगी तथा एक अन्तिम किस्त 54 लाख रुपये की होगी।

ऋण की प्रथम किस्त राज्य सरकार द्वारा वर्ष 1971-72 में ली गई। 1972-73 के परिशोधित प्राक्कलन में तथा 1973-74 के बजट प्राक्कलन में प्रत्येक किस्त 60 लाख रुपये की इस के लिये व्यवस्था की गई है।

17. व्यय से अधिक आय

व्यय से अधिक आय का बजट के समय 46.27 लाख रुपये के अनुमान के स्थान पर 1972-73 के परिशोधित प्राक्कलन में अब 1136.06 लाख रुपये का अनुमान है। 1089.79 लाख रुपये की अधिकता का विश्लेषण निम्न प्रकार है :-

(आय में वृद्धि :	लाख रुपयों में
(1) अंशदान	211.07
(2) राजस्व के अन्य शीर्ष जैसे व्याज, किराया आदि	190.76
(ब) नकद लाभों में न्यूनता	897.47
योग (अ तथा ब)	1300.20

(स) क्षतिपूर्ति द्वारा

(1) चिकित्सा एवं अन्य हितलाभ	136.30
(2) प्रशासनिक व्यय	17.87
(3) चिकित्सालय/ऑपेथलिय आदि	56.24
योग (स)	210.41

(शुद्ध अतिशेष 1089.79)

(लाख रुपये)

1973-74 के लिये बजट प्राक्कलन
प्राप्त

18(अ) नियोजक विशेष अंशदान

नियोजकों के विशेष अंशदान के द्वारा होने वाली आय का योजना परिपालित क्षेत्रों में मजदूर का 4 प्रतिशत की दर से तथा जहाँ योजना का कार्यान्वयन नहीं हुआ है वहाँ कुल मजदूरों का 3/4 प्रतिशत की दर से (4025.84 लाख रुपये) का अनुमान है।

(ब) कर्मचारी अंशदान

कर्मचारी अंशदान के अंतर्गत (1991.52 लाख रुपये) के उपबन्ध का अनुमान योजना परिपालित क्षेत्रों में कर्मचारियों की संख्या तथा नियत दर के आधार पर लगाया गया है।

(स) चिकित्सालय हितलाभ पर निगम द्वारा प्रारम्भिक रूप से धन किये गये व्यय में राज्य सरकारों का अंश।

1973-74 के बजट प्राक्कलन में "चिकित्सा हितलाभ में प्रारम्भिक रूप से निगम के द्वारा धन किये हुए व्यय में राज्य सरकारों/संघ राज्यों का अंश" शीर्ष के अंतर्गत 26.95 लाख रुपये की राशि सम्मिलित की गई है। यह राशि 1972-73 में दिल्ली के बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों तथा उनके परिवारों को दी जाने वाली चिकित्सा सुविधा के प्रशासन पर, निगम के द्वारा किये जाने वाले कुल खर्च में राज्य सरकार के अंश की वसूली का प्रतिनिधित्व करती है।

(व) ब्याज तथा लाभांश

शेष राकड़ के अधिशेष के विनियोजन तथा निगम के कर्मचारियों को बाहन आदि के क्रयण भवन निर्माण आदि के लिये दिये गये ऋण पर ब्याज तथा लाभांश से आय की अब 113.60 लाख रुपये की आशा है जबकि परीक्षाधीन प्राक्कलन में यह राशि 106.30 लाख रुपये थी।

(ई) निगम के निजी चिकित्सालयों तथा ऑपेथलियों के भवनों का किराया।

निगम के निजी चिकित्सालयों तथा ऑपेथलियों के भवनों के किराये के 268 लाख रुपये की राज्य सरकारों से वसूली की आशा है।

19. व्यय

1973-74 के बजट प्राक्कलन के विभिन्न शीर्षों के अन्तर्गत दिये हुए उपबन्धों में 1972-73 के परीक्षाधीन प्राक्कलन के तदनु रूप उपबन्धों की अपेक्षा जो बढ़ती पाई जाती है, वह प्रधानतः निम्न कारणों से है—

- (1) बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों के परिवारों पर चिकित्सा सुविधा का विस्तार।

(2) नये क्षेत्रों में योजना का विस्तार।

(3) उन क्षेत्रों में योजना का परिचालन करना, जहाँ योजना का कार्यान्वयन 1971-72 में पूरे एक वर्ष के लिए किया गया था।

तथा

(4) योजना परिपालित क्षेत्रों में रोजगार तथा पारिश्रमिक में प्रत्याशित बढ़ोतरी।

20. अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ

चिकित्सा हितलाभ के लिये 1973-74 के बजट में प्राक्कलन में 2491.12 लाख रुपये की व्यवस्था की गई है। यह व्यवस्था 1-4-1973 को कर्मचारियों की कल्पित संख्या के आधार पर की गई है जिसका कि अनुमान 31-3-72 के आंकड़ों से 6 प्रतिशत अधिक योजना के विस्तार तथा योजना परिपालित क्षेत्रों में बढ़ती हुई रोजगारी को देखते हुए लगाया गया है जैसा कि परिशिष्ट-2 में दिखाया गया है। इसमें 97.95 लाख रुपये की राशि जोकि निगम ने सीधे ही दिल्ली संघ राज्य में 1973-74 में बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों तथा उनके परिवारों के चिकित्सा हितलाभ के लिये खर्च करनी है तथा 12.30 लाख रुपये महाराष्ट्र राज्य में प्रसूति शुल्क के लिये देने हैं, सम्मिलित हैं। पिछले का 1/8 भाग (12.30 लाख रुपये) राज्य सरकार के दावे में से काट लिया जायेगा जिसका कि राज्य में चिकित्सा हितलाभ देने पर हुए व्यय की प्रतिपूर्ति करनी है।

चिकित्सा देय रख के स्तर के आधार पर, चिकित्सा सुविधा पर, प्रति बीमाकृत व्यक्ति, जो औसत व्यय है, वह प्रत्येक राज्य में भिन्न भिन्न है।

21. ब—नकद लाभ तथा स—अन्य लाभ

विभिन्न नकद लाभों के लिये जो उपबन्ध बनाये गये हैं वे मुख्यतः 1972-73 के प्रथम 8 माह के वास्तविक आंकड़ों पर आधारित हैं। जिन नये क्षेत्रों के योजना के अन्तर्गत आने की आशा है, लाभ अर्थात् को प्रारम्भ करने के लिये प्राप्त छूट दी गई है। वर्ष के दौरान रोजगार जीवित क्षतियों के कारण हुए ऐसे स्थायी (आंशिक व पूर्ण) अपंगता तथा अमृतजन, हितलाभ भी अब तक सामने आ चुके हैं/आने की संभावना है उनकी कुल देय धन राशि के पंजीकृत मूल्य की भी व्यवस्था कर ली गई है।

22. प्रशासन व्यय

प्रशासन व्यय दो शीर्षों के अंतर्गत दिखाये गये हैं। (अ) अधीक्षण तथा (ब) क्षेत्रीय कार्य 1 पैरा 7(ब) में दिये गये विचार के अधीन "अ-अधीक्षण" शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत मुख्यालय तथा क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों से सम्बन्धित प्रशासकीय व्यय आता है तथा "ब-क्षेत्रीय कार्य" शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत स्थानीय तथा निरीक्षण कार्यालयों से संबंधित उसी प्रकार खर्च आता है।

23. (अ) जो पद पहले से ही संस्वीकृत हो चुके हैं तथा उन पदों के लिये जो कुछ नये क्षेत्रों के लिये अपेक्षित हैं, उनके वेतन तथा भत्तों की व्यवस्था भी कर ली गई है।

23 (ब) 1973-74 के बजट में 555.01 लाख रुपये की व्यवस्था प्रशासन सम्बन्धी खर्चों के लिये है जो कि प्रति बीमाकृत व्यक्ति प्रति वर्ष 12.77 रुपये के लगभग आता है जब कि गोलू वर्ष के परीक्षाधीन प्राक्कलन में यह बीमाकृत व्यक्ति, प्रति वर्ष 12.17 रु. था।

(स) 1973-74 के बजट प्राक्कलन में अनुमानित प्रशासन व्यय कुल राजस्व का 8.41 प्रतिशत निकाला गया है जबकि 1972-73 के परीक्षाधीन प्राक्कलन में यह 9.90 प्रतिशत है।

(द) 'भरते तथा मानदेय' शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत दी गई व्यवस्था का विस्तृत विवरण परिशिष्ट-8 में दिया गया है।

24. आकीस्मक व्यय (अ—अधीक्षण तथा ब—क्षेत्रीय कार्य क्षेत्रों के अन्तर्गत) तथा स—अन्य खर्च।

वर्ष 1972-73 के मुख्यतः प्रथम 8 महीनों के वास्तविक आंकड़ों के आधार पर विभिन्न उप शीर्षों (जो स्वयं में उल्लिखित हैं) के अन्तर्गत व्यवस्था की गई है।

25. शीर्ष-3-चिकित्सालय, औषधालय तथा (संचित) दायित्व आवे।

1973-74 के बजट प्राक्कलन में 500 लाख रुपये का उपबंध निर्माण/चिकित्सा (संचित) दायित्व आरक्षित निधि में हस्तांतरित करने के लिये व्यवस्था की गई है। इस शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत के शेष 95 लाख रुपये की व्यवस्था निगम के निजी चिकित्सालयों तथा औषधालयों के भवनों के मूल्यहास, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण के लिये व्यवस्था की जाते हैं।

26. पूंजीगत व्यय

(अ) कार्यालय भवन (स्टाफ क्वार्टर सहित)

वर्ष 1973 में 73 लाख रुपयों की राशि कार्यालय भवनों (स्टाफ क्वार्टरों सहित) के निर्माण की लागत के लिये दी गई है।

(ब) चिकित्सालय तथा औषधालय

1973-74 के बजट प्राक्कलन में 260 लाख रुपयों की व्यवस्था चिकित्सालयों तथा औषधालयों के भवनों के निर्माण के लिये विभिन्न राज्य सरकारों के द्वारा अपेक्षित आवश्यकताओं के बारे में दी गई सूचना तथा निगम के द्वारा दी गई संस्वीकृत के आधार पर की गई है।

(स) स्टाफ कारें

वर्ष 1973-74 के बजट प्राक्कलन में स्टाफ कारों के क्रयण के लिये 50,000 रुपये का उपबंध किया गया है।

27. राज्य सरकारों को उधार

जैसा कि ऊपर पैरा 16 में दिया गया है 1973-74 के बजट प्राक्कलन में 60 लाख रुपयों की व्यवस्था महाराष्ट्र राज्य को 234 लाख रुपयों के संस्वीकृत ऋण की तीसरी किश्त को देने के लिये की गई है।

महाराष्ट्र राज्य को 4 औषधालयों तथा 3 चिकित्सालयों के भवनों के निर्माण के लिये 200 लाख रुपये के ऋण की स्वीकृति देने के लिये एक अन्य मसौदा विचाराधीन है। स्वीकृति होने पर, इस ऋण की 100 लाख रुपये की प्रथम किश्त वर्ष 1973-74 के दौरान राज्य सरकार को दी जाने की संभावना है। बजट प्राक्कलन 1973-74 में तदनुसार इस संबंध में आवश्यक उपबंध किया गया है।

28. व्यय से अधिक आय का अतिशेष

1973-74 के बजट प्राक्कलन में व्यय से अधिक आय के अतिशेष का अनुमान 687.90 लाख रुपये है।

बैंकों में तथा हाथ में नकद अतिशेष, आशा की जाती है कि निम्नलिखित होगा :—

31 मार्च 1973

5, 18, 49, 195 रुपये

31 मार्च 1974

4, 38, 61, 295 रुपये

[सं. जी. 20017/3/73-एच आई]

मी. ए. गोपालाकृष्णन, उप मुख्य लेखा अधिकारी
कृत विस्तीय सलाहकार तथा मुख्य लेखाधिकार

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 12th June, 1973

S.O. 2161.—In pursuance of section 36 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Revised Estimates for the year 1972-73 and the Budget Estimates for the year 1973-74 of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation as finally adopted by the said Corporation are hereby published for general information.

(Here set out the Revised Estimates for the year 1972-73 and the Budget Estimates for the year 1973-74).

EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION REVISED ESTIMATES FOR THE YEAR 1972-73 & BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE YEAR 1973-74

At their meetings held on the 17th and 18th February, 1972 the Standing Committee and the Corporation approved the Budget Estimates of the probable receipts and expenditure of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation for the financial year 1972-73. These were approved by the Central Government without any change vide Department of Labour & Employment letter No. G-20017(4)/72-HI dated the 24th April, 1972.

2. The Budget Estimates approved by the Central Government covered :—

(i) measures needed for the running of the Scheme in various centres where it has already been implemented; and

(ii) measures needed for the extension of the Scheme to additional areas.

3. When the Budget Estimates for 1972-73 were framed, it was anticipated that (i) the Scheme would be extended to new areas and (ii) medical care would be extended to the families of the Insured Persons as per programme detailed in Appendix-I and from the dates shown against each item in Columns 3 and 5 thereof. However, due to administrative and other difficulties in making adequate medical arrangements by the State Governments concerned, the programme of implementation and extension of medical care to the families had to be modified. The Scheme was actually extended to some of the areas from dates later than those originally planned as per details shown in Column 4 of Appendix-I. As regards the areas where the Scheme has not so far been implemented, the revised dates of implementation as now anticipated have been stated against each item in appropriate columns of the above statement. The dates from which the medical care has been or is likely to be extended to families have also been similarly indicated in Column 6 of Appendix-I.

4. As a result of further discussion and correspondence with the various State Governments, it is now anticipated that the Scheme will be implemented in new areas during the financial year 1972-73 and 1973-74 from the dates as shown in Appendix-II. For the sake of convenience, the places where the Scheme has already been implemented in the past, with dates of implementation, have also been embodied in this Appendix. The number of employees already covered or proposed to be covered has also been revised in the light of latest information available and incorporated in Appendix-II. The dates from which the medical care has been extended or is likely to be extended to the

families of the insured persons have also been indicated against each item in this Appendix.

5. The Revised Estimates for the financial year 1972-73 and the Budget Estimates for the next year 1973-74 have been prepared in the light of the revised programme of implementation except for slight modification to cover possible delay due to unforeseen reasons. The figures of actual receipts & expenditure during three financial year 1969-70 to 1971-72 the sanctioned Budget Estimates for the current financial year 1972-73 and the actuals for the first eight months of the current year 1972-73 have also been exhibited in the relevant columns of the tabulated Budget Statements A-I & II. These are submitted for consideration and approval.

6. The Statements A-I & II depict in Column 9 the figures of Revised Estimates 1972-73 and in the column 10, the figures of Budget Estimates 1973-74.

7. (a) Brief explanations for the more important items under the various heads are furnished in the following paragraphs. The Income and Expenditure Account for the year ending 31st March, 1973 together with the Balance Sheet as on that date and the Income and Expenditure Account for the year ending 31st March, 1974 together with the Balance Sheet as on that date have been cast, based on the figures of incomings and outgoings as anticipated in the Revised Estimates 1972-73 and the Budget Estimates 1973-74 respectively. These are enclosed for facility of perusal. In addition the following statements are appended :—

ACTUALS

1. Statement showing the Income and Expenditure region-wise for the year 1969-70.

Appendix-III

2. Statement showing the Income and Expenditure region-wise for the year 1970-71.

Appendix-IV

3. Statement showing the Income and Expenditure region-wise for the year 1971-72.

Appendix-V

BUDGET

4. Statement showing the anticipated Income and Expenditure region-wise for the year 1972-73.

Appendix-VI

5. Statement showing the Budgeted Income and Expenditure region-wise for the year 1973-74.

Appendix-VII

(b) The transactions shown under the heading 'Head quarters' in the above statements include expenditure on certain centralised items of expenditure incurred in respect of Regional and Local Officers also e.g., contribution to the Provident Fund of the Employees of the Corporation and Pension Reserve Fund, Leave and Pension Contribution payable in respect of Government servants on deputation in the Corporation, publicity, expenditure on contribution stamps, audit fees etc.

8. Contributions.

(a) Employers' Special Contribution.

The Employers' Special Contribution is payable by the employers @ 4 per cent of the total wage bill in implemented areas and @ 3/4 per cent of the total wage bill in non-implemented areas, within 30 days, after the expiry of the quarter in respect of which such contribution is payable.

(b) **Employees' Contribution.**—The Employees' Contribution is recoverable from the employees at all the centres where the scheme has been implemented at the Scheduled rates, for the whole or part of the year depending upon the date of coverage.

9. Medical Benefits.

(a) The expenditure under the head "A-Medical Benefits", but for the Union Territory of Delhi where the Scheme is directly administered by the Corporation, is initially incurred

by the State Governments and is later shared between the Corporation & the State Governments in the prescribed ratio of 7:1. The provision made under this head is intended to cover the Corporation's share of the expenditure.

(b) **Ceiling on Expenditure on Medical Benefits.**—The ceilings of shareable expenditure on medical benefits per Employee per annum have been revised as follows with effect from 1st April, 1972 :—

- (i) From Rs. 50 to Rs. 56 in the areas where restricted medical care is provided.
- (ii) From Rs. 54 to Rs. 60 in areas where expanded medical care is provided.
- (iii) From Rs. 64 to Rs. 70 in areas where full medical care is provided.

(c) **Payments to State Governments.**—The Corporation makes during the year advance 'on account' payments of about 90 per cent of its share of expenditure on medical benefits, on the basis of expenditure statement received from the State Governments, subject to adjustment on receipt of audit certificates from the State Accountants General. Previously the expenditure in liquidation of past liabilities on account of medical benefits was being met out of a special fund created with 0.5 per cent increase in Employers' Special Contribution with effect from 1-4-1970. The Standing Committee at its meeting held on 27-5-1972 has decided to utilize the Special fund exclusively for meeting the expenditure on Capital Construction and to meet the Past Liabilities on account of Medical Benefits, which are now nominal, out of the Revenue A/c. Budget provision under this head has been made accordingly and the funds required for meeting the current year's and past year's liabilities have been shown separately.

(b) **Expenses Incurred Directly by the Corporation.**—The provision made under the head "Medical treatment and care and maternity facilities, (expenses incurred directly by the Corporation)", includes the estimated Cost of Administration of the Medical care to the Insured Persons and their families in the Union Territory of Delhi, taken over by the Corporation with effect from 1st April, 1962. The anticipated recovery at the rate of 1/8th of shareable amount and the excess of expenditure over the ceilings has been taken into account in the Revised Estimates 1972-73 and Budget Estimates 1973-74 on the Revenue side under the head "State Governments'/Union Territories' share towards medical benefits initially incurred by the Corporation".

REVISED ESTIMATES FOR THE YEAR 1972-73

RECEIPTS

10. (a) The revenue of the Corporation for the current year 1972-73 is now estimated at Rs. 6,065.32 lacs as against Rs. 5,662.59 lacs assumed in the Budget i.e., and increase of Rs. 402.73 lacs.

10. (b) The increase in revenue comprises of Contributions (Rs. 211.97 lacs), and other heads of revenue (Rs. 190.76 lacs).

10. (c) **Interest and Dividends.**—Receipts on account of interest and dividends from the investments of surplus cash balance and interest on advances granted to Corporation employees for the purchase of conveyances, house building purposes etc., are expected to be Rs. 106.30 lacs as against the Budget Estimates for Rs. 40.32 lacs. The increase is mainly due to the margin of income over expenditure and the revised procedure regarding the collection, distribution and investment of corporation funds through a Centralised Account opened with the State Bank of India, New Delhi introduced with effect from 1-9-1971 which has enabled the investment of funds surplus to the immediate requirements being made on short/long term basis.

10. (d) **Rent of Hospital & Dispensary Buildings Owned by the Corporation.**—As against the original estimates of Rs. 129 lacs the income of the Corporation from rent of ESI Hospital & Dispensary Buildings together with the residential staff quarters attached thereto is now anticipated to go upto Rs. 266 lacs. The increase is due to the commissioning of more buildings and the realisation of arrears

of rent for previous years which was held up for want of fixation of standard rent. The rent so recovered will form a part of the shareable expenditure incurred by the State Governments on the provision of medical benefits to the insured persons and would, thus, be automatically apportioned between the Corporation and the State Governments in the prescribed ratio of 7:1.

EXPENDITURE

11. The expenditure on Revenue account in the current year 1972-73 is now estimated to be Rs. 4,929.26 lacs as against Rs. 5,616.32 lacs assumed in the Budget i.e. a decrease of Rs. 687.06 lacs.

12. Head-I-Benefits to insured persons and their families.

A-MEDICAL BENEFITS

Subject to the contents of para 9(c) *ante* the total provision under this head is Rs. 2,137.37 lacs which comprises of Rs. 1,863.99 lacs as Corporation's share of expenditure on medical treatment etc. and equipment for hospitals respectively, Rs. 88.63 lacs as expenditure on Medical Benefits in Delhi where the Scheme is directly administered by the Corporation and Rs. 11.70 lacs towards the payment of confinement fees payable under the scheme to the Insured women and wives of insured persons in Maharashtra Region. In respect of Delhi, the recovery of 1/8th expenditure and expenditure in excess of the ceilings have been taken into account on the receipt side of the Budget in 1973-74 when the amount is likely to be realised. The 1/8th amount due from Maharashtra will be adjusted when reimbursing their claim for expenditure on medical benefits.

13. B-cash benefits and C-other benefits.—The revised provision under Cash Benefits now stand at Rs. 1,741.70 lacs as compared to Rs. 2,639.17 lacs anticipated at the Budget stage. The fall in expenditure is mainly attributable to the effective administrative measures taken by the Corporation to reduce loose certification and the improvement in the law and order situation in West Bengal Region.

The amount of Rs. 12.22 lacs under 'C-Other Benefits' includes Rs. 5 lacs to be paid in 1972-73 as grant-in-aid to National Safety Council for prevention of accidents in industries, as sanctioned by Central Government.

14. Head-2-Administration expenses.—(a) The total expenditure on Administration Expenses during the year 1972-73 is anticipated to be Rs. 488.03 lacs as against Rs. 470.16 lacs originally provided for in the Budget Estimates. The increase is mainly attributable to higher provision under allowances and Honoraria and Contingencies. The rise in Allowances and Honoraria is due to additional 5 per cent house rent allowance granted to the Corporation's employees with effect from 1-6-1972 and the grant of Interim Relief to Corporation's employees with effect from 1-8-1972 as sanctioned by the Central Government to its employees.

(b) The provision for Administration Expenses has been made on the basis of actuals for the 1st 8 months of the current year 1972-73 and the anticipated requirements for the remaining four months.

(c) The per capita administration expenditure as per the Revised Estimates comes to Rs. 12.17 per insured employee per annum as against Rs. 11.39 anticipated at the Budget stage.

(d) The percentage of anticipated Administration Expenses to total Revenue in the Revised Estimates 1972-73 works out to 9.90 as against 8.30 in the actuals for 1971-72.

15. Expenditure on capital account.—The Standing Committee at its meeting held on 27-5-1972 has decided to utilise the special fund created with the increase of 0.5 per cent in Employers' Special Contribution with effect from 1-4-1970 exclusively for meeting the expenditure on Capital Construction in future.

The amount originally provided for expenditure on Capital Account was Rs. 134.75 lacs comprising of (i) Rs. 10 lacs for the construction office buildings (including staff quarters), (ii) Rs. 124 lacs for the construction of hospitals & dispensaries and (iii) Rs. 0.75 lacs for the purchase of staff cars.

The provision of Rs. 226.54 lacs has been made in the Revised Estimates 1972-73 as follows:—

(a) **Office Buildings (Including Staff Quarters).**—The provision of Rs. 10 lacs made in the Budget Estimates for 1972-73 has been raised to Rs. 16.44 lacs in Revised Estimates 1972-73. This is based on the trend of actuals and anticipated payments.

(b) **Buildings of Hospitals & Dispensaries.**—The provision of Rs. 124 lacs under this head has been enhanced to Rs. 208.60 lacs in the Revised Estimates 1972-73 on the basis of trend of actuals and anticipated payments.

(c) **Staff Cars.**—A provision of Rs. 1,50,000 has been made for the purchase of staff cars in the Revised Estimates 1972-73; against Rs. 75,000 provided in the Budget Estimates 1972-73.

16. LOANS TO STATE GOVERNMENT

The Standing Committee at its meeting held on 24th May, 1968 sanctioned a loan of Rs. 300 lacs to the State of Maharashtra for the construction of Hospitals etc. It was decided in consultation with the Central Government to make a loan of Rs. 234 lacs to the State Government in four yearly instalments, the first three instalments being of Rs. 60 lacs each and the last one of Rs. 54 lacs.

The first instalment of the said loan was drawn by the State Government during the year 1971-72. A provision of Rs. 60 lacs each has been made in the Revised Estimates for the year 1972-73 and Budget Estimates 1973-74.

17. EXCESS OF INCOME OVER EXPENDITURE

Against a surplus of Rs. 46.27 lacs estimated at the budget stage, excess of income over expenditure of Rs. 1,136.06 lacs has been anticipated in the Revised Estimates 1972-73. The excess of Rs. 1,089.79 lacs over the original estimates is analysed below:—

	Rs. in Lacs
(a) Increase in income:—	
(i) Contributions.	211.97
(ii) Other heads of Revenue o.g. interest, Rents etc.	190.76
(b) Decrease in Cash Benefits	897.47
Total (a & b) :—	1,300.20
(c) Offset by rise in :—	
(i) Medical & Other Benefits.	136.30
(ii) Admn. Expenses.	17.87
(iii) Hospitals/Dispensaries etc.	56.24
Total (c) :—	210.41
(Net Rs. 1,089.79 lacs)	

Contd.18

BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE YEAR 1973-74

RECEIPTS

18. (a) **Employees' Special Contribution.**—Income on account of Employers' Contribution (Rs. 4,025.74 lacs) has been estimated @ 4 per cent of total wages of the employees in the implemented areas & @ 3/4 per cent of the total wages in the non-implemented areas.

(b) **Employees' Contribution.**—The provision under Employers' Contribution (Rs. 1,991.52 lacs) has been made with reference to the estimated number of employees in the implemented centres and the scheduled rates.

(c) **State Governments' Share Towards Medical Benefits Initially Incurred by the Corporation.**—An amount of Rs. 26.95 lacs has been included in the Budget Estimates for the year 1973-74 under the head "State Governments/Union Territories' share towards Medical Benefits initially incurred

by the Corporation." This represents recovery of the State Governments' share of the expenditure likely to be incurred by the Corporation on the administration of medical care to the Insured Persons and their families in Delhi during 1972-73.

(d) **Interest and Dividends.**—Receipts on account of interest and Dividends from the investments of surplus cash balance and interest on advances granted to Corporation employees for the purchase of conveyances, house building purposes etc., are expected to be Rs. 113.60 lacs as against the Revised Estimates of Rs. 106.30 lacs.

(e) **Rent of Hospital and Dispensary Buildings Owned by the Corporation.**—A sum of Rs. 266 lacs is expected to be recovered from the State Governments on account of rent of the Hospital and Dispensary buildings owned by the Corporation.

19. EXPENDITURE

The increased provision under the various heads in the Budget Estimates for the year 1973-74 as compared to corresponding provision in the Revised Estimates for the year 1972-73 is mainly due to :—

- (i) the extension of medical care to the families of insured persons;
 - (ii) the extension of the Scheme to new areas;
 - (iii) the operation of the Scheme in areas where the implementation was brought about during the year 1971-72 for a full year;
- and
- (iv) expected increase in employment and wages in the implemented areas.

20. A-MEDICAL BENEFITS

A total provision of Rs. 2,491.12 lacs has been made in the Budget Estimates 1973-74 for medical benefits on the basis of assumed number of employees as on 1-4-1973, which has been estimated at 6 per cent higher than the figure as on 31-3-1972 as detailed in Appendix-II taking into account the extension of the scheme and to provide for the growth in employment in implemented areas. It includes Rs. 97.95 lacs to be incurred directly by the Corporation during 1973-74 for providing medical care to the Insured Persons and their families in the Union Territory of Delhi and also Rs. 12.30 lacs to be spent directly by the Corporation towards payment of confinement fees in the State of Maharashtra. 1/8th of the later (Rs.12.30 lacs) will be deducted from the claim of State Government for the reimbursement of expenses incurred by it on the provision of medical benefits to the insured persons in the state.

The average expenditure on medical care per insured person varies from state to state depending upon the type of medical care provided.

21. B-CASH BENEFITS & C-OTHER BENEFITS

Provision made for the various cash benefits and other benefits is based mainly on the actuals for the first 8 months of the year 1972-73. Due allowance has, however, been made for the commencement of Benefit periods in the new areas, expected to be covered under the scheme. The capitalised value of the total liabilities of the Permanent (partial & total) Disablement and Dependents' Benefits already arisen/expected to arise out of the employment injuries occurring in the course of the year have also been provided for.

22. ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES

The administration expenses have been exhibited under two heads, viz. "(A) Superintendence" and "(B) Field Work", subject to the remarks in para 7 (b), the head "A-Superintendence" embraces Administrative Expenditure relating to the Headquarters and the Regional Offices while 'B-Field Work' covers similar expenditure pertaining to the local and Inspection Offices.

23. (a) Provision on account of pay and allowances has been made for the posts which have already been sanctioned as also for posts required for certain new centres.

(b) A total provision of Rs. 555.01 lacs has been made in the Budget for the year 1973-74 for Administration Expenses which works out **Prorata** to about Rs. 12.72 per insured employee per annum, against Rs. 12.17 per insured employee per annum in the Revised Estimates of the current year.

(c) The percentage of estimated Administration Expenses to total Revenue in the Budget Estimates 1973-74 works out to 8.41 as against 9.90 in the Revised Estimates 1972-73.

(d) A statement showing detailed provision made under the head 'Allowances and Honoraria' is attached vide Appendix-VIII.

24. CONTINGENCIES (BOTH UNDER-A-SUPERINTENDENCE AND B-FIELD WORK) AND OTHER CHARGES

The provision under various sub-heads which are self explanatory has been made mainly on the basis of actuals for the first 8 months of the year 1972-73.

25. HEAD-3-HOSPITALS, DISPENSARIES AND CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION

A provision of Rs. 500 lacs has been made for transfer to the Capital Construction Reserve Fund in the Budget Estimates 1973-74. The remaining amount of Rs. 95 lacs provided under this head represents the anticipated expenditure on the depreciation, repairs & maintenance of Hospital & Dispensary buildings owned by the Corporation.

26. EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCOUNT

(a) **Office Buildings (Including Staff Quarters).**—A sum of Rs. 87 lacs has been provided in the year 1973-74 to cover the cost of construction of office buildings (including staff quarters).

(b) **Hospital and Dispensary Buildings.**—A provision of Rs. 260 lacs has been made in the Budget Estimates for the year 1973-74 for the construction of Hospital and Dispensary Buildings on the basis of requirements intimated by the various State Governments and sanctions accorded by the Corporation for the same.

(c) **Staff Cars.**—A provision of Rs. 50,000 has been made in the Budget Estimates for the year 1973-74 for the purchase of staff cars.

27. LOANS TO STATE GOVERNMENTS

Subject to remarks in para 16 above, a provision of Rs. 60 lacs has been made in the Budget Estimates 1973-74 for disbursement of third instalment of the loan of Rs. 234 lacs sanctioned by the Corporation to the State of Maharashtra.

Another proposal for the grant of loan of Rs. 200 lacs to the State of Maharashtra towards the construction of three Hospitals and four dispensary buildings, is under consideration. The first instalment of Rs. 100 lacs of this loan, if sanctioned, is likely to be drawn by the State Government during 1973-74. Necessary provision on this account has accordingly been made in the Budget Estimates 1973-74.

28. EXCESS OF INCOME OVER EXPENDITURE

A surplus of income over expenditure amounting to Rs. 687.90 lacs has been anticipated in the Budget Estimates 1973-74.

The closing Cash Balance with the banks and in hand is expected to be as below:—

31st March, 1973	Rs. 5,18,49,195
31st March, 1974	Rs. 4,38,61,295

कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम

EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION

31 मार्च, 1973 को समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष के आय और व्यय का लेखा (परिशोधित प्राक्कलन)

INCOME & EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDING 31ST MARCH, 1973 (REVISED ESTIMATES)				EXPENDITURE				
आय INCOME	लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Account	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	वास्तविक आंकड़े Actuals 1971-72	लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Account	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
वास्तविक आंकड़े Actuals 1971-72		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
	अनुदान द्वारा By Contributions :-				बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों तथा उनके परिवारों को हितलाभ 1. Benefits to Insured Persons and their families.			
33,34,80,630	केवल नियोजनार्थी का अंश Employers' Share only.	37,84,94,000			अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ A—Medical Benefits.			
17,70,05,192	केवल कर्मचारियों का अंश Employees' Share only.	18,44,65,000			राज्य सरकारों को उनके द्वारा निम्नलिखित पर किये गये व्यय के लिये निगम के अंश का भुगतान। Payments to State Governments etc. as Corporation's Share of their Expenses on providing :-			
51,04,85,822	कुल अनुदान Total Contributions.		56,29,59,000		चिकित्सा उपचार, देख रेख तथा प्रसविक सुविधाये (i) Medical treatment, care and Maternity facilities.			
7,50,000	निगम द्वारा चिकित्सा हितलाभ पर प्रारम्भिक रूप से किये गये व्यय में राज्य सरकार का अंश State Govts. share towards medi- cal benefits initially incurred by the Corporation.		25,04,000	16,09,79,000	वर्ष के दौरान किया गया व्यय (a) Expenditure during the year.	18,63,99,000		
	राजस्व के अन्य शीर्ष Other Heads of Revenue				पिछले वर्ष का दायित्व (b) Past year's liabilities.	1,73,05,000		
7,00,000	सहायता अनुदान Grants-in-aid			93,37,811	चिकित्सा उपचार तथा देख रेख तथा प्रसविक सुविधाये निगम द्वारा सीधे ही किया गया व्यय (ii) Medical Treatment & care and Maternity facilities (expenses directly incurred by the Corporation).	1,00,33,000		
37,04,897	ब्याज तथा लाभांश Interest & Dividends.	1,06,30,000		17,03,16,811	योग-अ-चिकित्सा हितलाभ TOTAL-A-MEDICAL BENEFITS			21,37,37,000
45,07,120	अतिपूर्ति Compensations.	28,43,000			ब—नकद हितलाभ B-CASH BENEFITS.			
	किराया महसूल व कर Rents, Rates & Taxes :			13,69,64,114	बीमारी हितलाभ	9,79,32,000		
3,45,633	निगम के कार्यालय (स्टाफ क्वार्टर सहित) (i) Offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters)	3,08,000		1,04,54,682	वास्तविक बीमारी हितलाभ	1,07,01,000		
1,45,18,882	चिकित्सालय, औषधालय तथा स्टाफ, क्वार्टर (ii) Hospitals, Dispensaries & Staff Quarters.	2,65,98,000		64,54,499	मातृत्व हितलाभ	70,99,000		
26,350	शुल्क जमाना तथा अधिहरण Fees, Fines & Forfeiture.	37,000		3,02,26,619	अपंगता हितलाभ			
8,22,992	विविध Miscellaneous.	6,53,000		2,14,37,135	अस्थायी (a) Temporary	2,08,82,000		
	राजस्व के अन्य शीर्ष का योग			41,98,506	स्थायी (पूंजीकृत मूल्य) (b) Permanent (Capitalised Value)	2,94,86,000		
2,46,25,874	Total of other Heads of Revenue.		4,10,69,000	8,00,982	आश्रितजन हितलाभ (पूंजीकृत मूल्य) 5. Dependents' Benefit (Capitalised Value)	72,21,000		
53,58,61,696	TOTAL CARRIED OVER		60,65,32,000	21,05,36,537	अल्पवृष्टि हितलाभ 6. Funeral Benefit.	8,49,000		
					कुल-ब-नकद लाभ TOTAL-B-CASH BENEFITS.			17,41,70,000
					योग आगे ले जाया गया TOTAL CARRIED OVER			38,79,07,000

आय INCOME				व्यय EXPENDITURE				
वास्तविक आंकड़े Actuals 1971-72	लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Account	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	वास्तविक आंकड़े Actuals 1971-72	लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Account	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.			Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
53,58,61,696	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		60,65,32,000		पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		38,79,07,000	
					स-अन्य लाभ C-OTHER BENEFITS.			
				34,538	अपंग बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों के पुनर्वास पर व्यय (a) Expenditure on Rehabilitation of disabled Insured Persons.	35,000		
				3,06,670	चिकित्सा मण्डल तथा अपील अधिकरण (b) Medical Boards and Appeal Tribunals.	2,72,000		
					बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों को भुगतान (c) Payment to Insured Persons on A/c of :-			
				1,24,152	सवारी शुल्क और/या मजदूरी की हानि Conveyance Charges & /or Loss of Wages.	1,15,000		
				—	महायता अनुदान Grant-in-aid.	5,00,000		
				2,92,698	विविध (d) Miscellaneous.	3,00,000		
				7,58,058	कुल स-अन्य हितलाभ TOTAL-C-OTHER BENEFITS.		12,22,000	
				38,16,11,406	कुल-1- बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों तथा उनके परिवारों को हितलाभ TOTAL-I-BENEFITS TO INSURED PERSONS & THEIR FAMILIES.			38,91,29,000
					2. प्रशासन व्यय 2-ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES			
					अ-अधीक्षण A-SUPERINTENDENCE			
					निगम, स्थायी समिति, क्षेत्रीय मण्डल आदि			
				42,658	1. Corporation, Standing Committee, Regional Boards.	91,000		
				1,44,887	प्रधान अधिकारी 2. Principal Officers.	1,92,000		
				24,50,940	अन्य अधिकारी 3. Other Officers.	26,78,000		

1,10,89,674	लिपिक वर्गीय कर्मचारी 4. Ministerial Establishment . . .	1,33,69,000	
19,25,109	चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी 5. Class IV Servants . . .	21,97,000	
33,96,068	आकस्मिक व्यय 6. Contingencies . . .	60,39,000	
	कुल-अ-अधीक्षण		
<u>1,90,49,336</u>	TOTAL-A-SUPERINTENDENCE		2,45,66,000
	ब-क्षेत्रीय कार्य B—FIELD WORKS		
6,41,950	अधिकारी 1. Officers . . .	7,82,000	
1,31,57,178	लिपिक वर्गीय कर्मचारी 2. Ministerial Establishment . . .	1,42,57,000	
21,87,274	चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी 3. Class IV Servants . . .	24,82,000	
16,82,359	आकस्मिक व्यय 4. Contingencies . . .	26,00,000	
	कुल-ब-क्षेत्रीय कार्य		
<u>1,76,68,761</u>	TOTAL-B-FIELD WORK		2,01,21,000
	म-अन्य खर्च C-OTHER CHARGES		
2,03,825	विधि खर्च Legal Charges . . .	2,53,000	
—	बीमा न्यायालय Insurance Courts . . .	2,50,000	
31,579	प्रचार तथा विज्ञापन Publicity & Advertisement . . .	97,000	
82,222	बैंकिंग लेखा रखने के खर्च Charges for maintaining Banking Accounts . . .	1,47,000	
91,184	लेखा परीक्षा शुल्क Audit Fee . . .	95,000	
1,14,180	छुट्टी वेतन तथा पेंशन अंशदान Leave Salary & Pension Contributions. . .	1,17,000	
6,01,126	मूल्यह्रास आदि Depreciation etc . . .	6,14,000	
	आगे ले जाया गया योग TOTAL CARRIED OVER . . .	15,73,000	4,46,87,000 38,91,29,000

आगे ले जाया गया योग
53,58,61,696 TOTAL CARRIED OVER

60,65,32,000

आय INCOME			
वास्तविक आंकड़े Actuals 1971-72	लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Account	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
	पिछे से लाया गया योग		
53,58,61,696	TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		60,65,32,000

व्यय EXPENDITURE				
वास्तविक आंकड़े Actuals 1971-72	लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Account	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD	15,73,000	4,46,86,000	38,91,29,000
	निवृत्ति लाभ Retirement Benefits			
97,36,419	पेंशन आरक्षित निधि में निगम का अक्षदान Corporation's Contribution to- wards Pension Reserve Fund	25,20,000		
2,22,447	कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम अक्षदायी भविष्य निधि में निगम का अक्षदान Corporation's Contribution towards Em- ployees' State Insurance Corporation Contributory Provident Fund	2,25,00		
	कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम भविष्य निधि को अदा किया गया ब्याज Interest paid to the ESIC Provident Fund.			
	सामान्य भविष्य निधि			
9,11,988	(i) General Provident Fund	7,40,000		
	(ii) Contributory Provident Fund	3,20,000		
(—) 9,76,653	कम: भविष्य निधि अतिरिक्त के विनि- योजन प्राप्त ब्याज। Less: Interest realised on investment of Provident Fund Balances (—) 12,91,000			
2,634	निगम के कर्मचारियों के लिये अनुकूपा आरक्षित निधि। Compassionate Reserve Fund for the Employees of the Corporation	4,500		
8	विविध Miscellaneous	24,500		
1,10,20,959	कुल -स- अन्य रु. में TOTAL-C-OTHER CHARGES		41,16,000	
4,77,39,056	कुल शीर्ष-2-अन्य प्रशासन व्यय TOTAL-HEAD-2-OTHER ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES			4,88,03,000
	3-चिकित्सालय तथा औषधालय 3. HOSPITALS AND DISPENSARIES			
16,45,619	चिकित्सालय के भवनो तथा चिकित्सालय व परीक्षण केन्द्रो के उपकरणो का मूल्यहास। (a) Depreciation of Hospital Buildings & Equipment in Hospitals & Exami- nation Centres		23,27,000	

			चिकित्सालय के भवनों की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण।	
	47,09,216	(b) Repair & Maintenance of Hospital Buildings.	66,67,000	
	4,04,35,000	पूँजीगत निर्माण/चिकित्सा दायित्व आदि (c) Capital Construction/Medical Liabilities etc	4,60,00,000	
	4,67,89,835	कुल शीर्ष-3 -चिकित्सालय तथा औषधालय TOTAL-HEAD-3-HOSPITALS & DISPENSARIES	5,49,94,000	
	47,61,40,297	राजस्व लेखा पर कुल व्यय TOTAL EXPENDITURE ON REVENUE ACCOUNT	49,29,26,000	
	5,97,21,399	व्यय के अधिक आय के प्रतिशेष को आय तुलन पत्र पर ले जाया गया Excess of Income over expendi- ture carried over to Balance Sheet.	11,36,06,000	
53,58,61,696	महायोग GRAND TOTAL	60,65,32,000	महायोग GRAND TOTAL	60,65,32,000

कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम
EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION

(परिशोधित प्रवक्तव्य) 31 मार्च, 1973 को तुलनपत्र
BALANCE SHEETS AS ON 31ST MARCH, 1973 (REVISED ESTIMATES)

वास्तविक आंकड़े 1971-72 Actuals 1971-72	दायित्व LIABILITIES	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	वास्तविक आंकड़े 1971-72 Actuals 1971-72	परिसम्पत्ति ASSETS	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
	व्यय से अधिक आय का प्रतिशेष Balance of excess of income over expenditure		Rs.		भूमि व भवन LANDS AND BUILDINGS	Rs.	Rs.
33,73,18,407	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	36,51,85,534			नियम के कार्यालयों के लिये भवन (स्टाफ क्वार्टर सहित) (a) Buildings for the offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters).		
5,97,21,399	वर्ष में संचयन Accumulations during the year	11,36,06,000			पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	2,56,97,030	
39,70,39,806			47,87.91.534	2,54,93,352	वर्ष में वृद्धि Additions during the year	16,44,000	
(—)3,18,54,272	पूजोगत निर्माण/चिकित्सा (संचित) दायित्व भारक्षित निधि को हस्तांतरित की राशि। Less Amount transferred to Capital construction /medical (accumulated) liabilities Reserve Fund.			2,03,678			2,73.41,030
36,51,85,534	पूजोगत निर्माण/भारक्षित निधि Capital Construction/Reserve Fund			2,56,97,030			
93,66,136	आदि शेष Opening Balance	2,46,32,495		25,69,90,369	चिकित्सालय तथा औषधालय (b) Hospitals & Dispensaries		
	व्यय से अधिक आय के अनिशेष से हस्तांतरित राशि। Amount transferred from balance of excess of income over expenditure.			1,58,59,906	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	27,28,50,275	
3,18,54,272				27,28,50,275	वर्ष में वृद्धि Additions during the year	2,08,60,000	29,37,10,275
4,04,35,000	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत उपबन्ध Add—Provision made during year	4,60,00,000		87,96,019	चिकित्सालयों के लिये उपकरण (c) Equipments for Hospitals		
8,16,55,408					पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet		87.96,019
(—)5,70,22,913	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत भुगतान Less—Payments made during year		7.06,32,495	2,27,313	स्टाफ कार Staff Cars		
2,46,32,495				18,785	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	2,46,098	
	स्थायी (आंशिक तथा पूर्ण) अप्रगता हितनाभ भारक्षित निधि Permanent (Partial & Total Disablement Benefit) Reserve Fund			2,46,098	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Add—Payments made during year	1,50,000	3.96,098
7,35,91,297	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	7,82,44,561			नियम के कार्यालयों के अध्यक्षों को स्थायी अग्रिम Permanent Advances to the Heads of offices of the Corporation		
2,14,37,135	वर्ष के अन्तर्गत उपबन्ध Provision made during year	2,94,86,000		30,632	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	34,772	
37,75,715	विनियोजन द्वारा प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment	43,22,000		4,145	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Add—Payments made during year	4,000	
9,88,04,147		11,20,52,561		34,777		38,772	
(—)2,05,59,586	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत भुगतान Less—Payments made during year	(—)2,30,87,000	8,89,65,561	(—)5	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत की गई वसूली Less—Recoveries made during year	(—)500	
7,82,44,561				34,772			38,272

आश्रितजन हितलाभ आरक्षित निधि Dependents' Benefit Reserve Fund			निगम के कर्मचारियों के स्थानान्तरण पर अग्रिम वेतन Advance of pay on transfer of the Employees' of the Corporation		
3,15,73,997	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	3,43,76,593	15,578	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	28,697
41,98,506	वर्ष के अन्तर्गत उपबन्ध Provision made during year	72,21,000	1,03,354	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Add—Payments made during year	1,10,000
16,63,434	विनियोजन द्वारा प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from	22,72,000	1,18,932		1,38,697
3,74,35,937	Investments	4,38,69,593	(—)90,235	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत की गई वसूली Less—Recoveries made during year	(—)1,10,000
(—)30,59,344	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत भुगतान Less—Payments made during year	(—)36,65,000	28,697		28,697
3,43,76,593		4,02,04,593			
कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम भविष्य निधि Employees' State Insurance Corporation Provident Fund			निगम के कर्मचारियों के स्थानान्तरण पर अग्रिम यात्रा भत्ता Advance of T.A. on transfer to the Employees of the Corporation		
1,54,51,602	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	1,78,88,438	34,670	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	64,836
	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत आकलित राशि Add—Amount credited during year		1,31,140	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Add—Payments made during year	1,20,000
42,30,555	कर्मचारियों का अंशदान Employees' Subscription	46,50,000	1,65,810		1,84,836
2,22,447	निगम का अंशदान Corporation's Contribution	2,25,000	(—)1,00,974	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत की गई वसूली Less—Recoveries made during year	(—)1,10,000
9,05,726	व्याज (कर्मचारियों तथा निगम के अंश पर) Interest (on Employees' and Corporation's shares)	10,60,000	64,836		74,836
2,08,10,330		2,38,23,438		निगम के कर्मचारियों को वाहन करण के लिये अग्रिम Advance for purchase of Conveyances to the Employees of the Corporation	
(—)29,21,892	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Less—Payments made during year	(—)38,50,000	9,03,903	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	8,76,900
1,78,88,438		1,99,73,438	4,79,937	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Add—Payments made during year	7,50,000
			13,83,840		16,26,900
			(—)5,06,940	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत की गई वसूली Less: Recoveries made during year	(—)5,75,000
			8,76,900		10,51,900
निगम के कार्यालयों के भवनों (स्टाफ क्वार्टर सहित) को मूल्यह्रास आरक्षित निधि Depreciation Reserve Fund of Buildings for the office of the Corporation (including staff quarters).			भवन निर्माण अग्रिम House Building Advances		
4,04,520	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	10,17,748	3,90,773	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	7,05,523
1,48,404	वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया उबन्ध Provision made during year	1,50,000	3,57,237	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Add—Payments made during year	15,00,000
64,824	विनियोजन द्वारा प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment	71,300	7,48,010		22,05,523
10,17,748		12,39,048	(—)42,487	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत की गई वसूली Less—Recoveries made during year	(—)1,25,000
52,13,45,369	आगे ले जाया गया योग TOTAL CARRIED OVER	69,98,06,669	7,05,523		20,80,523
			30,93,00,150	आगे ले जाया गया योग TOTAL CARRIED OVER	33,35,17,650

वास्तविक आंकड़े 1971-72 Actuals, 1971-72	दायित्व LIABILITIES	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
52,13,45,369	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		69,98,06,669
	चिकित्सालयों तथा परीक्षण केंद्रों के उपकरणों की मूल्यहास आरक्षित निधि। Depreciation Reserve Fund of Equipments in Hospitals and Examination Centres		
70,689	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	75,350	
1,036	वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year	..	
3,625	विनियोजन द्वारा प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment	5,100	
75,350			80,450
	चिकित्सालयों के भवनों की मूल्यहास आरक्षित निधि Depreciation Reserve Fund of Hospitals Buildings		
73,56,514	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	94,85,940	
16,44,584	वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year	23,27,000	
4,84,842	विनियोजन द्वारा प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment	6,52,000	
94,85,940			1,24,64,940
	स्टाफ कारों की मूल्यहास आरक्षित निधि Depreciation Reserve Fund of Staff Cars		
1,39,559	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	1,74,923	
24,644	वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year	34,000	
10,720	विनियोजन द्वारा प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment	12,000	
1,74,923			2,20,923

वास्तविक आंकड़े 1971-72 Actuals, 1971-72	परिसम्पत्ति ASSETS	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
30,93,00,150	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		33,35,17,650
	निगम के कर्मचारियों को विविध अग्रिम (त्योहार अग्रिम) Miscellaneous Advances to the Employees of Corporation (Festival Advances).		
6,28,487	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	10,42,900	
11,53,486	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Add—Payments made during year	5,50,000	
17,81,973		15,92,900	
(—)7,39,073	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत की गई वसूली Less—Recoveries made during year	(—)8,00,000	
10,42,900			7,92,900
	राज्य सरकारों की ओर से अग्रिम अदायगी Advance payment on behalf of State Governments		
3,227	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	2,281	
4,478	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Add—Payments made during year	5,000	
7,705		7,281	
(—)5,424	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत की गई वसूली Less—Recoveries made during year	(—)5,000	
2,231			2,281
	निम्नलिखित की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आदि के लिए राज्य सरकारों आदि को दिया गया अग्रिम Advances to the State Governments etc. for Repairs and Maintenance etc. of:—		
	निगम के कार्यालयों के भवन (स्टाफ क्वार्टर सहित) (a) Buildings of offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters).		
5,72,745	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	6,92,608	
1,19,863	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Add—Payments made during the year	1,64,000	
6,92,608		8,56,608	
..	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत वसूली/समयोजन Less—Recoveries / Adjustments during the year	(—)74,000	
6,92,608			7,82,608

निगम के कार्यालयों भवनों (स्टाफ क्वार्टरों सहित) की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आरक्षित निधि Repairs & Maintenance Reserve Fund of Buildings for the offices of the Corpora- tion (including staff quarters).			चिकित्सालय/शोधघालय आदि (B) Hospitals/Dispensaries etc.		
पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	17,42,716	21,19,643	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	36,86,069	34,10,837
वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया उपबन्ध Provisions made during year.	4,28,078	4,30,000	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Add : Payments made during year	17,58,649	31,81,000
विनियोजन द्वारा प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment.	66,584	79,500	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत समायोजन Less : Adjustment during year.	54,44,718	65,91,837
कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Less : Payments made during year.	(—)1,17,735	(—)74,000	25,55,143	(—)20,33,881	59,96,837
चिकित्सालयों के भवनों की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आरक्षित निधि लेखा। Repairs & Maintenance Reserve Fund Account of Hospital Buildings.	22,37,378	26,29,143	विविध भ्रष्टिम Miscellaneous Advances.	34,10,837	
पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	1,86,08,512	2,28,78,429	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	10,04,134	11,14,279
वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year.	47,09,216	66,67,000	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Add : Payments made during year.	2,88,015	2,80,000
विनियोजन द्वारा प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment.	7,87,833	12,70,400	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत प्राप्ति Less : Receipt during year.	12,92,149	13,94,279
कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Less : Payments made during year	(—)12,27,132	(—)5,95,000	राज्य सरकारों को स्वीकृत ऋण Loans granted to State Government	(—)1,77,870	(—)1,50,000
निगम के कर्मचारियों के लिए पेंशन आरक्षित निधि Pension Reserve Fund for the Em- ployees' of the Corporation.	2,41,05,561	3,08,15,829	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	11,14,279	12,44,279
पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	2,02,14,548	3,15,07,629	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Add : Payments made during year.	98,33,333	1,55,00,000
वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year.	1,02,96,500	25,20,000	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत ऋण की वापसी Less : Loans Refunded during year.	60,00,000	2,15,00,000
विनियोजन द्वारा प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment.	12,69,916	21,42,000	प्रेषित धन Remittances	1,58,33,333	
कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Less : Payments made during year	(—)2,73,335	(—)2,75,000	नकद प्रेषित धन Cash Remittances.	(—)3,33,333	2,11,67,000
आगे ले जाया गया योग TOTAL CARRIED OVER	58,75,87,283	78,12,43,583	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	1,55,00,000	2,33,400
			जमा—वर्ष में समायोजित विकलम Add : Debits adjusted during year.	9,20,855	25,00,000
			कम—वर्ष में समायोजित प्राकलम Less : Credits adjusted during year.	1,08,65,02,126	(—)25,00,000
			आगे ले जाया गया योग TOTAL CARRIED OVER	1,08,74,22,981	36,37,36,955

वास्तविक आंकड़े Actuals 1971-72	दायित्व LIABILITIES	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	वास्तविक आंकड़े Actuals 1971-72	परिसम्पत्ति ASSETS	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
58,75,87,283	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		78,12,43,583	33,12,96,455	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		36,37,36,955
	निगम के कर्मचारियों के लिये अनुकंपा आरक्षित निधि Compassionate Reserve Fund for the employees of the Corporation.				अन्य प्रेषित धन—विनिमय लेखा Other Remittances-Exchange Account.		
	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	10,000		(—)240	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	8,313	
10,000	वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year	4,500		2,92,96,464	जमा—वर्ष में जमा Add : Deposits during year	5,00,000	
2,634				2,92,96,224		5,08,313	
12,634	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Less : Payments made during year	(—)4,500		(—)2,92,87,911	कम—वर्ष में प्राकलन Less : Credits during year	(—)5,00,000	
(—)2,634				8,313			8,313
10,000	जमानत जमा उदाहरणार्थ ठेकेदार Deposits of Securities e.g. Con- tractors.		10,000		लागत पर विनियोजन Investments at Cost.		
	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	2,87,769			निगम के कार्यालयों के भवनों (स्टाफ क्वार्टर सहित) को मूल्यह्रास आरक्षित निधि। (a) Description Reserve Fund of buildings for the offices of the Cor- poration (including staff quarters).		
1,99,211	जमा—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत जमा Add : Deposits during the year	1,80,000		8,03,915	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	10,16,509	
1,71,333				7,92,594	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन Add : Investment made during year	2,21,300	
3,70,544	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत वापिस की गई जमानत जमा Less : Deposits repaid during the year	(—)1,40,000		15,96,509		12,37,809	
(—)82,775				(—)5,80,000	कम—भुगतान तिथि पर या विनियोजन की बिक्री पर उगाही। Less : Realisation on maturity or sale of investments.	—	12,37,809
2,87,769	अन्य जमा Other Deposits.		3,27,769	10,16,509			
	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	10,77,444			चिकित्सालय तथा परीक्षण केन्द्रों के उप- करणों की मूल्यह्रास आरक्षित निधि। (b) Depreciation Reserve Fund of equipments in Hospitals and Examination Centres.		
3,22,649	जमा—वर्ष में आंकलित राशि Add : Amount credited during year	10,00,000		63,100	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	75,125	
13,19,692				34,025	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन Add : Investments made during year	34,400	
16,42,341	कम—वर्ष के अन्तर्गत किया गया भुगतान Less : Payments made during year	(—)10,00,000		97,125		1,09,525	
(—)5,64,897				(—)22,000	कम—भुगतान तिथि या विनियोजन की बिक्री पर उगाही। Less : Realisation on maturity or sale of investment.	(—)29,000	
10,77,444			10,77,444	75,125			80,525

चिकित्सालयों के भवनों की मूल्यहास आरक्षित निधि (c) Depreciation Fund Reserve of Hospital Buildings.			
73,36,942	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	94,75,115	
62,07,300	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन Add: Investment made during	36,17,000	
1,35,44,242	year.	1,30,92,115	
(—)40,69,127	कम—भुगतान निधि पर या विनियोजन के बिक्री पर उपाही Less: Realisation on maturity or	(—)6,38,000	
94,75,115	sale of investment.		1,24,54,115
स्टाफ कारों की मूल्यहास आर- क्षित निधि (d) Depreciation Reserve fund of Staff Cars.			
1,38,717	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	1,73,735	
65,080	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन Add: Investments made during	55,000	
2,03,797	year.	2,28,735	
(—)30,062	कम—भुगतान निधि पर या विनियोजन के बिक्री पर उपाही Less: Realisation on maturity or	(—)9,000	
1,73,735	sale of investment.		2,19,735
निगम के कार्यालयों के भवनों (स्टाफ) क्वार्टर सहित) की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आरक्षित निधि । (e) Repairs & Maintenance Re- serve Fund of Buildings for the offices of the Corporation (includ- ing staff quarters).			
11,67,966	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	14,18,994	
9,79,400	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन Add: Investment during the	2,72,000	
21,47,366	year.	16,90,994	
(—)7,28,372	कम—भुगतान निधि पर या विनियोजन के बिक्री पर उपाही । Less: Realisation on maturity of	—	
14,18,994	sale of investment.		16,90,994
58,89,62,496	आगे ले जाया गया योग TOTAL CARRIED OVER	40,89,62,496	
34,34,64,246	आगे ले जाया गया योग TOTAL CARRIED OVER	37,94,28,446	

58,89,62,496 आगे ले जाया गया योग
TOTAL CARRIED OVER

40,89,62,496

34,34,64,246

आगे ले जाया गया योग
TOTAL CARRIED OVER

37,94,28,446

वास्तविक प्रांकड़े 1971-72 Actuals 1971-72	दायित्व LIABILITIES	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	वास्तविक प्रांकड़े 1971-72 Actuals 1971-72	परिसम्पत्ति ASSETS	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.			Rs.	Rs.
58,89,62,496	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		78,26,58,796	34,34,64,246	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		37,94,28,446
					चिकित्सालयों के भवनों की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण भारसित निधि। (f) Repairs & Maintenance Reserve Fund of Hospital Buildings.		
				1,48,85,952	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	1,94,60,250	
				1,88,21,600	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन Add: Investments made during year.	53,53,400	
				3,37,07,552		2,48,13,650	
				(—)1,42,47,302	कम—भुगतान तिथि पर या विनियोजन के बिक्री पर उगाही। Less: Realisation on maturity or sale of investment.	(—)11,92,000	
				1,94,60,250			2,36,21,650
					स्थायी (आंशिक तथा पूर्ण) भ्रमंभता हितलाभ भारसित निधि (g) Permanent (Partial & Total) Disablement Benefit Reserve Fund.		
				6,90,97,766	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	7,82,36,929	
				4,04,97,000	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन Add: Investments made during year.	1,11,21,000	
				10,95,94,766		8,93,57,929	
				(—)3,13,57,837	कम—विनियोग की बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली। Less: Realisation on maturity of sale of investments.	(—)4,08,000	
				7,82,36,929			8,89,57,929
					आश्रितजन हितलाभ भारसित निधि (h) Dependent's Benefit Reserve Fund.		
				3,15,72,371	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	3,43,75,507	

1,72,54,800	जमा—वर्ष में वित्तियोजन Add: Investment made during year.	1,31,57,000	
4,88,27,171		4,75,32,507	
(—)1,44,51,664	कम—वित्तियोग की बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली Less: Realisation on maturity or sale of investment.	(—)73,29,000	4,02,03,507
3,43,75,507			
1,54,29,750	कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम अविध्य निधि (i) E.S.I. Corporation Provident Fund. पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	1,78,86,888	
90,35,400	जमा—वर्ष में वित्तियोजन Add: Investment made during year.	38,28,000	
2,44,65,150		2,17,14,888	
(—)65,78,262	कम—वित्तियोग की बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली Less: Realisation on maturity or sale of investment.	(—)17,43,000	2,09,71,888
1,78,86,888			
2,01,95,910	निगम के कर्मचारियों के लिये पेशन आर-क्षित निधि। (i) Pension Reserve Fund for the Employees of the Corporation. पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	3,14,96,381	
2,49,09,700	जमा—वर्ष में वित्तियोजन Add: Investment made during year.	49,92,000	
4,51,05,610		3,64,88,381	
(—)1,36,09,229	कम—वित्तियोग की बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली Less: Realisation on maturity or sale of investment.	(—)4,70,000	3,60,18,381
3,14,96,381			
58,89,62,496	आगे ले जाया गया योग TOTAL CARRIED OVER.	52,49,20,201	58,92,01,801
78,26,58,796			

वास्तविक प्रांकड़े 1971-72 Actuals 1971-72	दायित्व Liabilities	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	वास्तविक प्रांकड़े 1971-72 Actuals 1971-72	परिसम्पत्ति Assets	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
58,89,62,496	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		78,26,58,796	52,49,20,201	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		58,92,01,101
					सामान्य रोकड़ शेष General Cash Balance		
					पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	2,26,07,800	
				28,90,07,800	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन Add: Investment made during year.	54,25,00,000	
				28,90,07,800		56,51,07,800	
					कम—विनियोग पर बिक्री या परिपक्व पर वसूली। Less: Realisation of maturity or sale of investment.	(—)42,35,00,000	
				(—)26,64,00,000		14,16,07,800	
				2,26,07,800			
				4,14,34,495	Cash in hand & with banks	5,18,49,195	
				6,40,42,295			19,34,56,995
58,89,62,496	महायोग GRAND TOTAL.		78,26,58,796	58,89,52,495	महायोग GRAND TOTAL		78,26,58,796

कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम

EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION

(बजट प्राक्कलन) 31 मार्च, 1974 को समाप्त होने वाले वर्ष के आय और व्यय का लेखा

Income & Expenditure Account for tee year ending 31st March, 1974 (Budget Estimates)

आय Income				व्यय Expenditure				
परिशोधित प्राक्कलन 1972-73 Revised Estimates 1972-73	लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Accounts	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	परिशोधित प्राक्कलन 1972-73 Revised Estimates 1972-73	लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Accounts	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
	अशदान द्वारा By Contributions :—				बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों तथा उनके परिवारों को हितलाभ			
37,84,94,000	केवल नियोजकों का अंश Employers' Share only	41,25,74,000			1. Benefits to Insured Persons and their families.			
18,44,65,000	केवल कर्मचारियों का अंश Employees' Share only	19,91,52,000			अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ A—Medical Benefits			
	कुल अशदान				निम्नलिखित के लिये राज्यो द्वारा किये गये व्यय में निगम के अंश की राज्य सरकारों को अदायगी :—			
56,29,59,000	Total Contributions		61,17,26,000		Payments to State Governments etc. as Corporations share of their Expenses on providing :—			
	निगम द्वारा चिकित्सा लाभ पर प्रारम्भिक रूप से किये गये व्यय में राज्य सरकारों का अंश State Govt.'s Share towards medi- cal benefits initially incurred by the Corporation		26,95,000		चिकित्सा उपचार व देख-रेख तथा प्रामाणिक सुविधाएं			
25,04,000	राजस्व के अन्य शीर्ष Other Heads of Revenue				(i) Medical treatment and care and Maternity facilities			
	ब्याज तथा लाभांश Interest & Dividends	1,13,60,000		18,63,99,000	(a) Expenditure during the year	22,63,40,000		
1,06,30,000	अतिपूर्ति Compensations	27,74,000		1,73,05,000	पिछले वर्ष के दायित्व (b) Past years liabilities	4,09,97,000		
28,43,000	किराया, महसूल तथा कर Rents, Rates & Taxes :—				चिकित्सा उपचार व देख-रेख तथा प्रामाणिक सुविधाएं (निगम द्वारा सीधे रूप में किया गया व्यय)			
	निगम के कार्यालय (स्टाफ क्वार्टर सहित) (i) Offices of the Corporation (including Staff Qrs.)	3,24,000		1,00,33,000	(ii) Medical treatment & care & maternity facilities (expenses directly incurred by the Cor- porations	1,10,25,000		
3,08,000	चिकित्सालय/श्रीषधालय तथा स्टाफ क्वार्टर			21,37,37,000	कुल—अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ TOTAL—A—MEDICAL BENEFITS	27,83,62,000		
2,65,98,000	(ii) Hospitals/ Dispensaries & Staff Quarters.	2,66,00,000			ब—नकद लाभ B—CASH BENEFITS			
37,000	मूल्य, जुर्माना तथा अधिहरण Fees, Fines & Forfeitures	30,000		9,79,32,000	बीमारी हितलाभ			
6,53,000	विविध Miscellaneous	6,96,000		1,07,01,000	1. Sickness Benefit	10,56,80,000		
	राजस्व के अन्य शीर्षों का योग			70,99,000	विस्तारित बीमारी हितलाभ			
4,10,69,000	TOTAL OTHER HEADS OF REVENUE		4,17,84,000	2,08,82,000	2. Extended Sickness Benefit	1,12,65,000		
	आगे ले जाया गया योग			2,94,86,000	मातृत्व हितलाभ			
60,65,32,000	TOTAL CARRIED OVER		65,62,05,000	16,61,00,000	3. Maternity Benefit	76,40,000		
					अस्थायी अप्रगता हितलाभ			
					4. Disablement Benefits			
					अस्थायी			
					(a) Temporary	2,43,01,000		
					स्थायी (पूंजीकृत मूल्य)			
					(b) Permanent (Capitalized Value)	3,48,70,000		
					आगे ले जाया गया योग			
					TOTAL CARRIED OVER	18,37,56,000	27,83,62,000	

आय Income				व्यय Expenditure				
परिमोचित प्राक्कलन	लेखा के शीर्ष	राशि	राशि	परिमोचित प्राक्कलन	लेखा के शीर्ष	राशि	राशि	राशि
1972-73				1972-73				
Revised Estimates	Head of Accounts	Amount	Amount	Revised Estimates	Head of Accounts	Amount	Amount	Amount
1972-73				1972-73				
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
60,65,32,000	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		65,62,05,000	16,61,00,000	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD	18,37,56,000	27,83,62,000	
				72,21,000	आश्रितजन हितलाभ (पूजीकृत मूल्य) 5. Dependents Benefit (Capitalized Value)	85,81,000		
				8,49,000	अन्त्येष्टि हितलाभ 6. Funeral Benefit	8,92,000		
					योग—ब—नकद लाभ			
				17,41,70,000	TOTAL—B—CASH BENEFITS		19,32,29,000	
					म—अन्य हितलाभ			
					C—OTHER BENEFITS			
					अपग बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों के पुनर्वास पर व्यय			
				35,000	(a) Expenditure on Rehabilitation of disabled insured persons.	41,500		
				2,72,000	चिकित्सा मंडल तथा अपील अदिकरण (b) Medical Boards & Appeal Tribunals	3,69,000		
					बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों को अदायगी (c) Payments to insured persons:—			
				1,15,000	मजदूरी की हानि तथा सवारी शुल्क (i) Conveyance Charges & or loss of wages	1,37,500		
				5,00,000	सहायता अनुदान (d) Grant-in-aid	—		
				3,00,000	विविध (e) Miscellaneous.	3,35,000		
				12,22,000	कुल—स—अन्य लाभ TOTAL—C—OTHER BENEFITS		8,23,000	
					कुल—1—बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों तथा उनके परिवारों को कुल लाभ			
				38,91,29,000	TOTAL—1—BENEFITS TO INSURED PERSONS AND THEIR FAMILIES		47,24,14,000	
					2—प्रशासन व्यय 2—ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES			
					अ—अधीक्षण A—SUPERINTENDENCE			
				91,000	नियम, स्थायी समिति, क्षेत्रीय मंडल आदि 1 Corporation, Standing Committee, Regional Boards etc.	83,000		
				1,92,000	प्रधान अधिकारी 2. Principal Officers	1,91,000		

अन्य अधिकारी		
26,78,000	3. Other Officers	32,29,000
निपिक वर्गीय कर्मचारी		
1,33,69,000	4. Ministerial Establishment	1,64,97,000
चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी		
21,97,000	5 Class IV Servants	26,97,000
आकस्मिक व्यय		
60,39,000	6. Contingencies	52,83,000
कुल—अ-अधीक्षण		
2,45,66,000	TOTAL—A-SUPERINTENDENCE	2,79,80,000

ब-क्षेत्रीय कार्य		
B-FIELD WORK		
अधिकारी		
7,82,000	1. Officers	9,70,000
निपिक वर्गीय कर्मचारी		
1,42,57,000	2 Ministerial Establishment	1,69,53,000
चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी		
24,82,000	3. Class IV Servants	30,55,000
आकस्मिक व्यय		
26,00,000	4. Contingencies.	26,18,000
कुल—ब-क्षेत्रीय कार्य		
2,01,21,000	TOTAL—B-FIELD WORK	2,35,96,000

म—अन्य खर्च		
C-OTHER CHARGES		
विविध खर्च		
2,53,000	Legal Charges	2,52,000
बीमा न्यायालय		
2,50,000	Insurance Courts	60,000
प्रचार व्यय		
97,000	Publicity Charges	31,000
बैंकिंग लेखा रखने के खर्च		
1,47,000	Charges for maintaining Banking Accounts	60,000
छुट्टी वेतन तथा पेंशन अंशदान		
95,000	Leave Salary & Pension Contributions	85,000
लेखा परीक्षा शुल्क		
1,17,000	Audit Fees	1,00,000

आगे ले जाया गया योग
60,65,32,000 TOTAL CARRIED OVER

65,62,05,000

आगे ले जाया गया योग
12,59,000 TOTAL CARRIED OVER 5,88,000 5,15,76,000 47,24,14,000

आय INCOME				व्यय EXPENDITURE				
परिमोदित प्राक्कलन 1972-73 Revised Estimates 1972-73	लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Accounts	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	परिमोदित प्राक्कलन 1972-73 Revised Estimates 1972-73	लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Accounts	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
60,65,32,000	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		65,62,05,000	12,59,000	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD	5,88,000	5,15,76,000	47,24,14,000
				6,14,000	मूल्यह्रास आदि Depreciation etc.	6,33,000		
				25,20,000	पेंशन आरक्षित निधि में निगम का अंशदान Corporation's Contribution towards Pension Reserve Fund.	27,60,000		
				2,25,000	कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम अंशदायी भविष्य निधि में निगम का अंशदान Corporation's Contribution towards Employees' State Insurance Corporation Contributory Provident Fund.	2,25,000		
					कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम भविष्य निधि को अदा किया हुआ ब्याज			
					INTEREST PAID TO THE ESIC PROVIDENT FUND			
				7,40,000	सामान्य भविष्य निधि (i) General Provident Fund	10,00,000		
				3,20,000	अंशदायी भविष्य निधि (ii) Contributory Provident Fund	3,30,000		
				(—) 12,91,000	कम—भविष्य निधि के प्रतिशेषों के विनियोजन से प्राप्त ब्याज Less—Interest realised on Investment of Provident Fund Balances	(—) 16,37,000		
				4,500	निगम के कर्मचारियों के लिए अनुकंपा आरक्षित निधि Compassionate Reserve Fund for the Employees of the Corporation	6,000		
				24,500	विविध Miscellaneous	20,000		
				41,16,000	कुल—सम्बन्धित खर्चें TOTAL—C-OTHER CHARGES		39,25,000	
				4,88,08,000	कुल शीर्ष—2-प्रशासन व्यय TOTAL—HEAD 2—ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES			5,55,01,000

3—चिकित्सालय तथा औषधालय

3—HOSPITALS AND DISPENSARIES

(क) चिकित्सालय के भवनों व चिकित्सालय तथा परीक्षण केन्द्रों के उपकरणों का मूल्यहानि

23,27,000	(a) Depreciation of Hospital Buildings & Equipment in Hospitals & Examination Centres.	25,00,000
-----------	--	-----------

चिकित्सालय के भवनों की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण

66,67,000	(b) Repair & Maintenance of Hospitals Buildings.	70,00,000
-----------	--	-----------

पूंजीगत निर्माण आरक्षित निधि

4.60,00,000	(c) Capital Construction/Reserve Fund.	5,00,00,000
-------------	--	-------------

कुल शीर्ष 3—चिकित्सालय तथा औषधालय

5,49,94,000	TOTAL—HEAD 3—HOSPITALS & DISPENSARIES	5,95,00,000
-------------	--	-------------

राजस्व लेखा पर कुल व्यय

49,29,26,000	TOTAL EXPENDITURE ON REVENUE ACCOUNT	58,74,15,000
--------------	---	--------------

व्यय से अधिक आय के अतिशेष को आगे तुलन पत्र पर ले जाया गया

11,36,06,000	Excess of income over expenditure carried over to Balance Sheet.	6,87,90,000
--------------	--	-------------

कुल योग

60,65,32,000	GRAND TOTAL	65,62,05,000	60,65,32,000	GRAND TOTAL	65,62,05,000
--------------	-------------	--------------	--------------	-------------	--------------

कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम
EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION
 31 मार्च, 1974 को तुलन पत्र (बजट प्राक्कलन)
BALANCE SHEET AS ON 31st MARCH, 1974 (BUDGET ESTIMATES)

परिशोधित प्राक्कलन 1972-73 Revised Estimates 1972-73	दायित्व LIABILITIES	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	परिशोधित प्राक्कलन 1972-73 Revised Estimates 1972-73	परिमप्यति Assets	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.			Rs.	Rs.
	व्यय से अधिक आय का अतिशेष Balance of excess of income over expenditure.				भूमित तथा भवन Lands and Buildings.		
	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	36,51,85,534	47,87,91,534		(क) निगम के कार्यालयों के लिये भवन (स्टाफ क्वार्टर सहित) (a) Buildings for the offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters).		
11,36,06,000	वर्ष में संचयन Accumulations during the year.	6,87,90,000		2,56,97,030	पिछले तुलन पत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	2,73,41,030	
47,87,91,534			54,75,81,534	16,44,000	वर्ष में सकलन Additions during the year	87,00,000	
	पूंजीगत निर्माण/आरक्षित निधि Capital Construction Reserve Fund.			2,73,41,030			3,60,41,030
2,46,32,495	पिछले तुलन पत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	7,06,32,495			(ख) चिकित्सालय तथा औषधालय (b) Hospitals & Dispensaries.		
4,60,00,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया उपबन्ध Add : Provision made during year.	5,00,00,000		27,28,50,275	पिछले तुलन पत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	29,37,10,275	
7,06,32,495			12,06,32,495	2,08,60,000	वर्ष में संकलन Additions during the year	2,60,00,000	
	स्थायी (आंशिक तथा पूर्ण) अर्पणता निन्ताम आरक्षित निधि Permanent (Partial & Total) Disablement benefit Reserve Fund.			29,37,10,275			31,97,10,275
7,82,44,561	पिछले तुलन पत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	8,89,65,561			(ग) चिकित्सालयों के लिये उपकरण (c) Equipments for Hospitals.		
2,94,86,000	वर्ष में किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year	3,48,70,000		87,96,019	पिछले तुलन पत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet		87,96,019
43,22,000	वित्तियोजन में प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment.	53,30,000			स्टाफ कारें Staff Cars		
11,20,52,561		12,91,65,561		2,46,098	पिछले तुलन पत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	3,96,098	
(—)2,30,87,000	कम—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Less: Payments made during year.	(—)2,52,17,000		1,50,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Add : Payments made during year	50,000	
8,89,65,511			10,39,48,561	3,96,098			4,46,098

आश्रितजन हितलाभ आरक्षित निधि
Dependent's Benefits Reserve Fund.

3,43,76,593	पिछले तुलन पत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	4,02,04,593
72,21,000	वर्ष में किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year	85,81,000
22,72,000	विनियोजन से प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment	29,46,000
4,38,69,593		5,17,31,593
(—)36,65,000	कम—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Less : Payments made during year.	(—)41,63,000
4,02,04,593		4,75,68,593
1,78,88,438	कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम भविष्य निधि Employees' State Insurance Cor- poration Provident Fund.	
1,78,88,438	पिछले तुलन पत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	1,99,73,438
	जमा—वर्ष के दौरान आंकित राशि Add : Amount credited during year:—	
46,50,000	कर्मचारी चन्दा Employees' Subscription.	52,50,000
2,25,000	निगम का अंशदान Corporation's Contribution.	2,25,000
10,60,000	व्याज (कर्मचारियों तथा निगम के अंशदान पर) Interest (on Employees' and Cor- poration's shares).	13,30,000
2,38,23,438		2,67,78,438
(—)38,50,000	कम—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Less : Payments made during year.	(—)41,50,000
1,99,73,438		2,26,28,438
69,85,67,621	आगे ले जाया गया योग TOTAL CARRIED OVER	84,23,59,621

निगम के कार्यालयों के अध्यक्षों को स्थायी अग्रिम
Permanent Advances to the Heads of
offices of the Corporation.

34,772	पिछले तुलन पत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	38,272
4,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Add: Payments made during year.	7,000
38,772		45,272
(—)500	कम—वर्ष में हुई वसूली Less : Recoveries made during year.	(—)500
38,272		44,772
	निगम के कर्मचारियों के स्थानान्तरण पर अग्रिम वेतन Advance of pay on transfer to the Employees' of the Corporation.	
28,697	पिछले तुलन पत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	28,697
1,10,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Add : Payments made during year.	1,20,000
1,38,697		1,48,697
(—)1,10,000	कम—वर्ष में हुई वसूली Less : Recoveries made during year.	(—)1,20,000
28,697		28,697
	निगम के कर्मचारियों को स्था- नान्तरण पर अग्रिम यात्रा भत्ता Advance of T. A. on transfer to the Employees of the Corporation.	
64,836	पिछले तुलन पत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet.	74,836
1,20,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Add : Payments made during year.	1,30,000
1,84,836		2,04,836
(—)1,10,000	कम—वर्ष में की गई वसूली Less : Recoveries made during year.	(—)1,20,000
74,836		84,836
33,03,85,227	आगे ले जाया गया योग TOTAL CARRIED OVER	36,51,51,727

परिशोधित प्राक्कलन 1972-73 Revised Estimates 1972-73	दायित्व LIABILITIES	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	परिशोधित प्राक्कलन 1972-73 Revised Estimates 1972-73	परिसम्पत्ति ASSETS	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
69,85,67,621	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD निगम के कार्यालयों के भवनों (स्टाफ क्वार्टर सहित) की मूल्यह्रास आरक्षित निधि Depreciation Reserve Fund of Build- ings for the offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters). पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet. वर्ष में किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year. विनियोजन से प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment.		84,23,59,621	33,03,85,227	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD निगम के कर्मचारियों को वाहत ऋण के लिये अग्रिम Advances for purchase of convey- ances to the Employees of the Cor- poration. पिछले तुलनपत्र के आधार पर As per last balance sheet. जमा—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Add : Payments made during year. कम—वर्ष की गई वसूली Less : Recoveries made during year		36,51,51,727
10,17,748		12,39,048		8,76,900		10,51,900	
1,53,000		1,60,000		7,50,000		8,80,000	
71,300		88,000		16,26,900		19,31,900	
12,39,048			14,87,048	(—)5,75,000		(—)6,10,000	13,21,900
	चिकित्सालयों तथा परीक्षण केन्द्रों में उपकरणों की मूल्यह्रास आरक्षित निधि Depreciation Reserve Fund of Equipments in Hospitals and Examination Centres. पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet. वर्ष में किया गया उपबन्ध Interest received from investment.			10,51,900	भवन निर्माण अग्रिम House Building Advances पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet. जमा—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Add : Payments made during year. कम—वर्ष में की गई वसूली Less: Recoveries made during year.		
75,350		80,450		7,05,523		20,80,523	
5,100		5,500		15,00,000		15,00,000	
80,450			85,950	22,05,523		35,80,523	
	Depreciation Reserve Fund of Hospitals Buildings. पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet. वर्ष में किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year. विनियोजन से प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment.			(—)1,25,000		(—)2,00,000	33,80,523
94,85,940		1,24,64,940		20,80,523	निगम के कर्मचारियों को विभिन्न अग्रिम (त्यौहार अग्रिम) Miscellaneous Advances to the Employees of the Corporation (Festival Advances). पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet. जमा—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Add : Payments made during year. कम—वर्ष में की गई वसूली Less : Recoveries made during year.		
23,27,000		25,00,000		10,42,900		7,92,900	
6,52,000		8,94,000		5,50,000		6,30,000	
1,24,64,940			1,58,58,940	15,92,900		14,22,900	
				(—)8,00,000		(—)7,50,000	6,72,900
				7,92,900			

स्टाफ कारो को मूल्यह्रास आरक्षित निधि Depreciation Reserve Fund of Staff Cars.			राज्य सरकार की ओर से अधिम अदायगी Advances Payments on behalf of State Governments.		
1,74,923	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	2,20,923	2,281	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	2,281
34,000	वर्ष में किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year	23,000	5,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Add: Payments made during year	6,000
12,000	विनियोजन से प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment	15,300	7,281		8,281
2,20,923		2,59,223	(—)5,000	कम—वर्ष में की गई वसूली Less: Recoveries made during year	(—)6,000
	निगम के कार्यालयों के भवनों (स्टाफ क्वार्टर सहित) की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आरक्षित निधि Repairs & Maintenance Reserve Fund of Buildings for the Offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters).		2,281		2,281
21,19,643	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	25,55,143		चिकित्सालयों व औषधालयों की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण के लिए राज्य सरकारों आदि को अधिम राशि। Advances to the State Govern- ments etc. for Repairs and Maintenance of Hospitals & Dispensaries.	
4,30,000	वर्ष में किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year	4,50,000		(क) निगम के कार्यालयों के भवन (स्टाफ क्वार्टर सहित) (a) Buildings for Offices of the Corporation (including staff Quarters).	
79,500	विनियोजन से प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment	1,10,600			
26,29,143		31,15,743	6,92,608	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	7,82,608
(—)74,000	कम—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Less: Payments made during year	(—)1,50,000	1,64,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Add: Payments made during year	2,00,000
25,55,143		29,65,743	8,56,608		9,82,608
	चिकित्सालयों के भवनों की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आरक्षित निधि लेखा Repairs & Maintenance Reserve Fund Account of Hospital Buildings.		(—)74,000	कम—वर्ष में वसूली/समायोजन Less: Recoveries/Adjustments during year	(—)1,50,000
2,28,78,429	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	3,02,20,829	7,82,608		8,32,608
66,67,000	वर्ष में किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year	70,00,000		(ख) चिकित्सालय तथा औषधालय आदि (b) Hospitals & Dispensaries etc.	
12,70,400	विनियोजन से प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment	16,01,200	34,10,837	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	59,96,837
3,08,15,829		3,88,22,029	31,81,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Add: Payments made during year	35,00,000
(—)5,95,000	कम—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Less: Payments made during year	(—)7,00,000	65,91,837		94,96,837
3,02,20,829		3,81,22,029	(—)5,95,000	कम—वर्ष में समायोजन Less: Adjustment during year	(—)7,00,000
74,53,48,954	आगे ले जाया गया योग TOTAL CARRIED OVER	90,11,38,554	59,96,837	आगे ले जाया गया योग TOTAL CARRIED OVER	87,96,837
			34,10,92,276		38,01,58,776

परिशोधित प्राक्कलन Revised Estimates 1972-73	दायित्व LIABILITIES	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	परिशोधित प्राक्कलन Revised Estimates 1972-73	परिसम्पत्ति ASSETS	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
74,53,48,954	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		90,11,38,554	34,10,92,276	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		38,01,58,776
	निगम के कर्मचारियों के लिए पेंशन आरक्षित निधि <i>Pension Reserve Fund for the Employees' of the Corporation</i>				विविध अग्रिम <i>Miscellaneous Advances</i>		
3,15,07,629	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	3,58,94,629		11,14,279	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	12,44,279	
25,20,000	वर्ष में किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year	27,60,000		2,80,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Add: Payments made during year	3,20,000	
21,42,000	विनियोजन से प्राप्त व्याज Interest received from investment	24,93,000		13,94,279		15,64,279	
3,61,69,629		4,11,47,629		(—)1,50,000	कम—वर्ष में प्राप्त Less: Receipts during year	(—)2,00,000	
(—)2,75,000	कम—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Less: Payments made during year	(—)2,80,000		12,44,279			13,64,279
3,58,94,629			4,08,67,629		राज्य सरकारों को स्वीकृत उधार राशि <i>Loans granted to State Govts.</i>		
	निगम के कर्मचारियों के लिए अनुकंपा आरक्षित निधि <i>Compassionate Reserve Fund for the Employees' of the Corpo- ration.</i>			1,55,00,000	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	2,11,67,000	
10,000	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	10,000		60,00,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Add: Payments made during year	1,60,00,000	
4,500	वर्ष में किया गया उपबन्ध Provision made during year	6,000		2,15,00,000		3,71,67,000	
14,500		16,000		(—)3,33,000	कम—राज्य सरकार द्वारा ऋण की वापसी Less: Refund of loans by State Governments	(—)3,33,000	
(—)4,500	कम—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान Less: Payments made during year	(—)6,000		2,11,67,000			3,68,34,000
10,000			10,000		प्रेषित धन <i>Remittances.</i>		
	जमानत जमा उदाहरणार्थ ठेकेदार <i>Deposits of Securities e.g. con- tractors.</i>				नकद प्रेषित धन <i>Cash Remittances.</i>		
2,87,769	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	3,27,769		2,33,400	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	2,33,400	
1,80,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया उपबन्ध Add: Deposits during the year	2,00,000		25,00,000	जमा—वर्ष में समायोजित विकलन Add: Debits adjusted during year	27,00,000	
4,67,769		5,27,769		27,33,400		29,33,400	
(—)1,40,000	कम—वर्ष में जमा जमानत की वापसी Less: Deposits repaid during year	(—)1,50,000		(—)25,00,000	कम—वर्ष में समायोजित आकलन Less: Credits adjusted during year	(—)27,00,000	
3,27,769			3,77,769	2,33,400			2,33,400

अन्य जमा		
Other deposits.		
पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार		
10,77,444	As per last balance sheet	10,77,444
जमा—वर्ष में आंकलित व्याज		
10,00,000	Add: Amount credited during year	10,00,000
20,77,444		20,77,444
कम—वर्ष में किया गया भुगतान		
(—)10,00,000	Less: Payments made during year	(—)10,00,000
10,77,444		10,77,444
78,26,58,796 TOTAL CARRIED OVER		
		94,34,71,396

अन्य प्रेषित धन विनिमय लेखा		
Other Remittances-Exchange Account.		
पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार		
8,313	As per last balance sheet	8,313
जमा—वर्ष में विकसन		
5,00,000	Add : Debits during year	6,00,000
5,08,313		6,08,313
कम—वर्ष में आकलन		
(—)5,00,000	Less: Credits during year	(—)6,00,000
8,313		8,313
लागत पर विनियोजन		
Investments at Costs.		
(क) निगम के कार्यालयों की इमारतों (स्टाफ क्वार्टरों सहित) का मूल्यह्रास आरक्षित निधि		
(a) Depreciation Reserve Fund of Buildings for the Offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters).		
पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार		
10,16,509	As per last balance sheet	12,37,809
जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन		
2,21,300	Add: Investment made during year	2,68,000
12,37,809		15,05,809
कम—विनियोग की बिक्री या परिष्कार पर वसूली		
—	Less: Realisation on maturity or sale of investment.	(—)19,500
12,37,809		14,86,309
(ख) चिकित्सालयों व परीक्षण केंद्रों में उपकरणों की मूल्यह्रास आरक्षित निधि		
(b) Depreciation Reserve Fund of equipments in Hospitals and Examination Centres.		
पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार		
75,125	As per last balance sheet	80,525
जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन		
34,400	Add: Investments made during year	5,500
1,09,525		86,025
कम—विनियोग की बिक्री या परिष्कार पर वसूली		
(—)29,000	Less : Realisation on maturity or sale of investments	—
80,525		86,025
36,50,63,602 TOTAL CARRIED OVER		
		42,01,71,102

परिशोधित प्राक्कलन Revised Estimates 1972-73	दायित्व LIABILITIES	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
78,26,58,796	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		94,34,71,396

परिशोधित प्राक्कलन Revised Estimates 1972-73	परिसम्पत्ति ASSETS	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
36,50,63,602	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		42,01,71,102
	चिकित्सालयों की इमारतों की मूल्यह्रास आरक्षित निधि (c) Depreciation Reserve Fund of Hospitals Buildings.		
94,75,115	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	1,24,54,115	
36,17,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया विनियोग Add : Investments made during year	38,31,000	
1,30,92,115		1,62,85,115	
(—)6,38,000	कम—विनियोग की बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली Less : realisation on maturity or sale of investments	(—)4,37,000	
1,24,54,115			1,58,48,115
	स्टाफ कारों की मूल्यह्रास आरक्षित निधि (d) Depreciation Reserve Fund of Staff Cars.		
1,73,735	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	2,19,735	
55,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया विनियोग Add : Investment made during year	38,300	
2,28,735		2,58,035	
(—)9,000	कम—विनियोग के बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली Less : Realisation on maturity or sale of investments	—	
2,19,735			2,58,035
	निगम के कार्यालयों की इमारतों (कम- चारियों के क्वार्टरों सहित) की मर- म्मत व अनुरक्षण आरक्षित निधि (e) Repairs & Maintenance Re- serve Fund of Buildings for the Offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters).		
14,18,994	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	16,90,994	
2,72,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया विनियोग Add : Investment during the year	2,11,000	
16,90,994			19,01,994

चिकित्सालयों की इमारतों की मरम्मत
व अनुरक्षण आरक्षित निधि
(f) Repairs & Maintenance Reserve
Fund of Hospitals Buildings

पीछे से लाया गया योग		
1,94,60,250	As per last balance sheet . . .	2,36,21,650
53,53,400	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन	
	Add: Investments made during year	82,02,400
2,48,13,650		3,18,24,050

कम—विनियोग की बिक्री या परिष्कार पर वसूली			
(—)11,92,000	Less : realisation on maturity or sale of investment . . .	(—)38,00,700	2,80,23,350
2,36,21,650			

म्यायी (प्रांशिक तथा पूर्ण) अपंगता
हितलाभ आरक्षित निधि
(g) Permanent (Partial & Total)
Disablement Benefit Reserve
Fund

पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार		
7,82,36,929	As per last balance sheet . . .	8,89,57,929
1,11,21,000	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन	
	Add : Investments made during year	2,49,46,000
8,93,57,929		11,39,03,929

कम—विनियोग की बिक्री या परिष्कार पर वसूली			
(—)4,00,000	Less : Realisation on maturity or sale of investment . . .	(—)99,63,000	10,39,40,929
8,89,57,929			

आश्रितजन हितलाभ आरक्षित निधि
(h) Dependents' Benefit Reserve.

पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार		
3,43,75,507	As per last balance sheet. . .	4,02,03,507
1,31,57,000	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन	
	Add : Investment made during year	76,38,300
4,75,32,507		4,78,41,807

कम—विनियोग की बिक्री या परिष्कार पर वसूली			
(—)73,29,000	Less: Realisation on maturity or sale of investment . . .	(—)2,74,300	4,75,67,507
4,02,03,507			

कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम भविष्य
निधि
(i) E.S.I. Corporation Provident Fund

आगे ले जाया गया योग			
53,22,11,532	TOTAL CARRIED OVER		61,77,11,032

78,26,58,796 आगे ले जाया गया योग
TOTAL CARRIED OVER

94,34,71,396

परिशोधित प्राक्कलन 1972-73 Revised Estimates 1972-73	दायित्व LIABILITIES	राशि Amount	राशि Amount	परिशोधित प्राक्कलन 1972-73 Revised Estimates 1972-73	ASSETS	राशि Amount	राशि Amount
Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
78,26,58,796	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		94,34,71,396	53,22,11,532	पीछे से लाया गया योग TOTAL BROUGHT FORWARD		61,77,11,032
				1,78,86,888	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	2,09,71,888	
				38,28,000	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन Add: Investment made during year	50,92,500	
				2,17,14,888		2,60,64,388	
				—7,43,000	कम—विनियोग की बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली Less: Realisation on maturity or sale of investment	(—)1,96,500	2,58,67,888
				2,09,71,888			
					निगम के कर्मचारियों के लिए पेंशन आरक्षित निधि (j) Pension Reserve Fund for Employees of the Corporation		
				3,14,96,381	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	3,60,18,381	
				49,92,000	जमा—वर्ष में विनियोजन Add: Investment made during year	56,57,400	
				3,64,88,381		4,16,75,781	
				(—)4,70,000	कम—विनियोग के बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली Less: Realisation on maturity or sale of investment.	(—)30,02,400	3,86,73,381
				3,60,18,381			
					सामान्य रोकड़ शेष General Cash Balance		
				2,26,07,800	पिछले तुलनपत्र के अनुसार As per last balance sheet	14,16,07,800	
				54,25,00,000	जमा—वर्ष में किया गया विनियोग Add: Investment made during year	55,00,00,000	
				56,51,07,800		69,16,07,800	
				(—)42,35,00,000	कम—विनियोग के बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली Less Realisation on maturity or sale of investment	(—)47,42,50,000	
				14,16,07,800		21,73,57,800	
				5,18,49,195	हाथ रोकड़ और बैंक के पास रोकड़ Cash in hand & with Bankers	4,38,61,295	26,12,19,095
				19,34,56,995			
78,26,58,796	महायोग GRAND TOTAL		94,34,71,396	78,26,58,796	महायोग GRAND TOTAL		94,34,71,396

कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम
EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION
वर्ष 1972-73 के लिये परिशोधित प्राक्कलन तथा
वर्ष 1973-74 के लिये बजट प्राक्कलन
Revised Estimates for the year 1972-73 and
Budget Estimates for the Year 1973-74.

आय
RECEIPTS

विवरण- 'ए'-I
STATEMENT-'A'-I

लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Accounts	वास्तविक आंकड़े			चालू वर्ष 1972-73 के लिये स्वीकृत बजट प्राक्कलन	चालू वर्ष 1972-73 के लिये परिशोधित प्राक्कलन			अगले वर्ष 1972-73 के लिये बजट प्राक्कलन	
	Actuals for the year			Sanctioned Budget Estimates for the current year 1972-73	REVISED ESTIMATES FOR THE CURRENT YEAR 1972-73			Budget Estimates for the next year 1973-74.	
	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72		चालू वर्ष 1972- 73 के प्रथम आठ महीनों के वास्तविक आंकड़े Actuals for first 8 months of the current year 1972-73.	चालू वर्ष 1972- 73 के शेष चार महीनों की प्रत्याक्षित आय Anticipated receipts of the remaining 4 months of the current year 1972-73	चालू वर्ष 1972- 73 के लिये परि- शोधित प्राक्कलन (खा 7+8) Revised Esti- mates for the current year 1972-73 (Col. 7+8)		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
राजस्व के प्रधान शीर्ष									
I. Principal Heads of Revenue									
अंशदान									
Contributions:—									
केवल नियोक्ताओं का अंश Employers' Share only.		21,25,42,559	29,55,06,981	33,34,80,630	35,24,45,000	26,34,20,117	11,50,73,883	37,84,94,000	41,25,74,000
केवल कर्मचारियों का अंश Employees' Share only.		15,20,48,404	16,49,66,819	17,70,05,192	18,93,17,000	12,16,52,208	6,28,12,792	18,44,65,000	19,91,52,000
चिकित्सा हितलाभ पर नियम द्वारा प्रारंभिक रूप से किये गये व्यय में राज्य सरकारों/ संघ राज्यों के अंश। State Governments'/Union Terri- tories' share towards medical bene- fit initially incurred by the Corpora- tion.		6,84,513	14,29,296	7,50,000	16,13,000	—	25,04,000	25,04,000	26,95,000

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
राजस्व के अन्य शीर्षः OTHER HEADS OF REVENUE:									
सहायक अनुदान									
II. Grant-in-aid.	7,00,000
व्याज तथा लाभांश									
III. Interests & Dividends.	33,46,082	37,82,273	37,04,897	40,32,500	53,13,578	53,16,422	1,06,30,000	1,13,60,000	1,13,60,000
क्षतिपूर्ति									
IV. Compensations.	21,17,306	4,12,671	45,07,120	51,03,000	1,27,547	27,15,453	28,43,000	27,74,000	27,74,000
किराया, महसूल तथा कर :									
V. Rents, Rates & Taxes:									
निगम के कार्यालय (स्टाफ क्वार्टरों सहित)									
(i) Offices of the Corporation (including Staff Qrs.)	1,34,103	2,14,769	3,45,633	2,70,000	2,62,234	45,766	3,08,000	3,24,000	3,24,000
चिकित्सालय, औषधालय तथा स्टाफ क्वार्टर									
(ii) Hospitals, Dispensaries & Staff Quarters.	1,15,99,250	2,91,12,763	1,45,18,882	1,29,45,000	1,060	2,65,96,940	2,65,98,000	2,66,00,000	2,66,00,000
शुल्क, जुर्माना तथा अविहरण									
VI. Fees, Fines & Forfeitures.	32,977	18,866	26,350	18,500	33,063	3,937	37,000	30,000	30,000
विविध									
VII. Miscellaneous.	5,28,852	5,44,410	8,22,992	5,15,000	4,36,076	2,16,924	6,53,000	6,96,000	6,96,000
कुल राजस्व									
TOTAL REVENUES.	38,30,34,046	49,59,88,848	53,58,61,696	56,62,59,000	39,12,45,883	21,52,86,117	60,65,32,000	65,62,05,000	65,62,05,000
ऋण, जमा, अग्रिम व प्रेषित-धन									
Debt, Deposits, Advances & Remittances :									
साधारण ऋण									
Ordinary Debts:									
राज्य सरकार द्वारा ऋण की वापसी									
Loans refunded by State Government.	..	1,66,667	3,33,333	3,33,000	3,33,333	(—)333	3,33,000	3,33,000	3,33,000
योग									
TOTAL	..	1,66,667	3,33,333	3,33,000	3,33,333	(—)333	3,33,000	3,33,000	3,33,000
निविमुक्त ऋण :									
Unfunded Debt :									
निगम की सामान्य निधि :									
ESIC General Provident Fund									
कर्मचारियों का चन्दा									
Employees' Subscription.	25,60,417	29,88,657	35,45,118	35,00,000	29,39,100	9,60,900	39,00,000	45,00,000	45,00,000
कर्मचारियों के चन्दे पर व्याज									
Interest on Employees' Subscription.	4,21,480	5,22,989	6,20,942	7,00,000	..	7,40,000	7,40,000	10,00,000	10,00,000

क० रा० बी० नि० अंशदायी मविष्य निधि :								
ESIC Contributory Provident Fund :								
कर्मचारियों का चन्दा								
Employees' Subscription..	5,73,559	6,35,204	6,85,437	7,00,000	5,56,631	1,93,369	7,50,000	7,50,000
निगम का अंशदान								
Corporations' Contribution	2,15,290	2,06,610	2,22,447	2,25,000	..	2,25,000	2,25,000	2,25,000
निम्नलिखित पर व्याज :								
Interest on:								
कर्मचारियों का चन्दा								
Employees' Subscription..	1,14,888	1,39,788	1,64,212	1,80,000	..	1,80,000	1,80,000	1,80,000
निगम का अंशदान								
Corporation's Contribution..	83,865	1,00,440	1,20,572	1,40,000	..	1,40,000	1,40,000	1,50,000
कम—पेंशन आरक्षित निधि को हस्तांतरित राशि								
Less: amount transferred to Pension Reserve Fund.	(—)71,628	(—)2,957
कुल निधिमुक्त ऋण								
Total Unfunded Debt	38,97,871	45,90,731	53,58,728	54,45,000	34,95,731	24,39,269	59,35,000	68,05,000
जमा, अग्रिम और आरक्षित निधि :								
Deposits Advances & Reserve Funds :								
निगम के कार्यालयों की इमारतों (कर्मचारियों के नवार्टरों सहित) की मूल्यहास आरक्षित निधि :								
Depreciation Reserve Fund account of Buildings for the offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters) :								
निधि को हस्तांतरित वार्षिक मूल्यहास व्यय								
(i) Annual Depreciation charges transferred to fund.	1,45,860	1,48,616	1,48,404	1,50,000	..	1,50,000	1,50,000	1,60,000
विनियोजन पर उपचित व/या वसूल किया व्याज								
(ii) Interest accrued &/or realised on investments.	20,264	38,695	64,824	69,000	47,248	24,052	71,300	88,000
चिकित्सालयों तथा परीक्षण केन्द्रों के उपकरणों का मूल्यहास आरक्षित निधि								
Depreciation Reserve Fund on A/C of equipments in Hospitals & Examination Centres.								
निधि को हस्तांतरित वार्षिक मूल्यहास व्यय								
(i) Annual Depreciation charges transferred to fund.	4,052	2,068	1,035

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
	विनियोजन पर उपचित व/या वसूल किया जाना।								
(ii)	Interest accrued &/or realised on investments.	2,599	2,599	3,625	3,800	3,396	1,704	5,100	5,500
	चिकित्सालयों की इमारतों का मूल्यह्रास आरक्षित निधि लेखा Depreciation Reserve Fund account of Hospital Buildings.								
(i)	निधि को हस्तांतरित वार्षिक मूल्यह्रास व्यय Annual Depreciation charges transferred to Fund.	15,14,304	16,37,389	16,44,584	16,50,000	—	23,27,000	23,27,000	25,00,000
(ii)	विनियोजन पर उपचित व/या वसूल किया गया व्याज Interest accrued &/or realised on investment	1,88,501	4,13,447	4,84,841	6,45,000	4,33,35	2,18,649	6,52,000	8,94,000
	स्टाफ कारों का मूल्यह्रास आरक्षित निधि लेखा Depreciation Reserve Fund account of staff cars.								
(i)	निधि को हस्तांतरित वार्षिक मूल्यह्रास व्यय Annual depreciation charges transferred to fund	21,975	22,719	24,644	25,000	—	34,000	34,000	23,000
(ii)	विनियोजन पर उपचित व/या वसूल किया गया व्याज Interest accrued &/or realised on investments	4,633	5,557	10,720	11,000	7,897	4,103	12,000	15,300
	निगम के कार्यालयों की इमारतों (स्टाफ क्वार्टरों सहित) की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आरक्षित निधि Repairs & Maintenance Reserve Fund of Buildings for the offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters).								
(i)	निधि को हस्तांतरित वार्षिक अनुरक्षण व मरम्मत व्यय Annual Maintenance & Repairs charges transferred to fund.	4,20,700	4,28,693	4,28,078	4,30,000	—	4,30,000	4,30,000	4,50,000
(ii)	विनियोजन पर उपचित व/या वसूल किया गया व्याज Interest accrued &/or realised on investments	45,739	54,648	66,584	72,000	56,969	22,531	79,500	1,10,600
	कम—वर्ष में वास्तविक भुगतान Deducts—Actual Payments during the year.	(—)5,036	(—)1,35,482	(—)1,17,735	(—)2,56,000	—	(—)74,000	(—)74,000	(—)1,50,000

<p>चिकित्सालयों की इमारतों की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण के मद में आरक्षित निधि Repairs & Maintenance Reserve Fund account of Hospital Buildings.</p> <p>निधि को हस्तांतरित वार्षिक अनुरक्षण मरम्मत व्यय</p>								
(i) Annual Repair & Maintenance charges transferred to the fund	43,45,746	47,17,209	47,09,216	47,20,000	—	66,67,000	66,67,000	70,00,000
विनियोजन पर उपचित व/या वसूल किया गया व्याज								
(ii) Interest accrued &/or realised on investments	3,27,713	5,45,948	7,87,833	12,80,000	8,92,899	3,77,501	12,70,400	16,01,200
कम—वर्ष में वास्तविक भुगतान Deduct:— Actual payments during the year	(—)18,571	(—)79,417	(—)12,27,132	(—)5,50,000	—	(—)5,95,000	(—)5,95,000	(—)7,00,000
<p>स्वाई (आंशिक और पूर्ण) अपंगता हितलाभ आरक्षित निधि का लेखा Permanent (Partial & Total) Disablement Benefit Reserve Fund Account.</p> <p>वार्षिक राशि का निधि में हस्तांतरण</p>								
(i) Annual amount transferred to the fund	2,40,03,000	3,16,94,000	2,14,37,135	3,80,50,000	—	2,94,86,000	2,94,86,000	3,48,70,000
विनियोजन पर उपचित व/या वसूल किया गया व्याज								
(ii) Interest accrued &/or realised on investments	25,21,369	27,91,536	37,75,715	42,00,000	28,97,793	14,24,207	43,22,000	53,30,000
कम—वर्ष में वास्तविक भुगतान Deduct:— Actual payments during the year.	(—)1,78,14,256	(—)1,99,87,882	(—)2,05,59,586	(—)2,38,28,000	—	(—) 2,30,87,000	(—)2,30,87,000	(—)2,52,17,000
<p>आश्रितजन हितलाभ आरक्षित निधि Dependent's Benefit Reserve Fund Account.</p> <p>वार्षिक राशि का निधि में हस्तांतरण</p>								
(i) Annual amount transferred to fund.	49,79,000	66,59,000	41,98,506	81,11,000	—	72,21,000	72,21,000	85,81,000
विनियोजन पर उपचित व/या वसूल किया गया व्याज								
(ii) Interest accrued &/or realised on investments.	11,51,704	12,49,253	16,63,433	19,70,000	13,98,057	8,73,943	22,72,000	29,46,000
कम—वर्ष में वास्तविक भुगतान Deduct:— Actual payments during the year.	(—)21,05,661	(—)25,54,162	(—)30,59,344	(—)35,60,000	—	(—)36,65,000	(—)36,65,000	(—)41,63,000

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
निगम के कर्मचारियों की पेंशन आरक्षित निधि Pension Reserve Fund for the Employees of the Corporation.									
निधि को हस्तान्तरित वार्षिक अंशदान									
(i) Annual contribution transferred to fund	57,85,568	24,63,347	1,02,96,500	27,69,000	—	25,20,000	25,20,000	27,60,000	
बिनिधान पर उपचित व/या वसूल किया व्याज									
(ii) Interest accrued &/or realised on investments	5,50,407	9,52,887	12,69,916	19,88,000	14,07,733	7,34,267	21,42,000	24,93,000	
कम—वास्तविक वार्षिक अदायगी									
Deduct:— Actuals payments during the year	(—)2,75,678	(—)1,60,709	(—)2,73,335	(—)2,50,000	—	(—)2,75,000	(—)2,75,000	(—)2,80,000	
निगम के कर्मचारियों के लिये अनुकंपा आरक्षित निधि									
Compassionate Reserve Fund for the Employees of the Corporation	—	1,230	2,634	5,000	—	4,500	4,500	6,000	
कम—वर्ष में वास्तविक भुगतान									
Deduct:— Actual payments during the year	—	(—)1,230	(—)2,634	(—)5,000	—	(—)4,500	(—)4,500	(—)6,000	
विशेष निर्माण/विकित्सा (वित्त) आरक्षित निधि									
Special Construction/Reserve Fund.									
निधि को हस्तान्तरित राशि									
Amount transferred to the Fund	—	3,69,64,000	4,04,35,000	4,30,00,000	—	4,60,00,000	4,60,00,000	5,00,00,000	
Reserve Fund.									
कम—वर्ष में वास्तविक भुगतान									
Deduct:—Actual payments during the year	—	(—)10,40,19,294	(—)5,70,22,913	(—)2,35,25,000	—	—	—	—	
आरक्षित निधियों का योग									
TOAL RESERVE FUNDS	2,58,13,932	(—)3,61,45,335	91,90,548	5,71,80,800	71,45,343	7,08,19,957	7,79,65,300	8,93,17,600	
जमा									
Deposits.									
जमानत जमा									
Deposits of Securities	1,20,702	1,34,386	1,71,333	1,25,000	79,348	1,00,652	1,80,000	2,00,000	
अन्य जमा (शुद्ध)									
Other Deposits (net)	1,86,253	7,54,795	22,00,000	9,95,506	4,494	10,00,000	10,00,000	
कुल जमा									
TOTAL DEPOSITS	1,20,702	3,20,639	9,26,128	23,25,000	10,74,854	1,05,146	11,80,000	12,00,000	

अग्रिम

ADVANCES :

स्वाई अग्रिम

(a) Permanent Advances	145	285	5	500	60	440	500	500
----------------------------------	-----	-----	---	-----	----	-----	-----	-----

नियम के कर्मचारियों को अग्रिम :—

(b) Advances to the employees of the Corporation :—

स्थानान्तरण पर अग्रिम वेतन

(i) Advance of pay on transfer	80,156	81,591	90,239	1,00,000	68,918	41,082	1,10,000	1,20,000
--------------------------------	--------	--------	--------	----------	--------	--------	----------	----------

स्थानान्तरण पर अग्रिम वादा भत्ता

(ii) Advance of T.A. on transfer	90,790	91,141	1,00,975	1,00,000	62,668	47,332	1,10,000	1,20,000
--	--------	--------	----------	----------	--------	--------	----------	----------

मोटर वाहन के क्रय के लिये अग्रिम

(iii) Advance for the purchase of Motor Conveyances	2,07,085	2,64,544	3,01,843	3,50,000	2,05,568	1,19,432	3,25,000	3,50,000
---	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

अन्य वाहनों के क्रय के लिये अग्रिम

(iv) Advances for the purchase of other conveyances	1,73,049	2,02,518	2,05,097	2,50,000	1,53,198	96,802	2,50,000	2,60,000
---	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	--------	----------	----------

गृह निर्माण के लिये अग्रिम राशि

(v) House Building advances	43,391	37,925	42,487	60,000	69,877	55,123	1,25,000	2,00,000
---------------------------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	----------	----------

विविध

(vi) Miscellaneous	3,50,277	5,53,556	7,39,074	6,50,000	6,55,799	1,44,201	8,00,000	7,50,000
------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

अन्य अग्रिम

(c) OTHER ADVANCES :

राज्य सरकारों की ओर से अग्रिम अदायगी

(i) Advance payments on behalf of State Governments	3,435	3,932	5,424	4,500	3,807	1,193	5,000	6,000
---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

राज्य सरकारों/राजकीय लोक निर्माण विभागों को मरम्मत और अनुरक्षण इत्यादि के लिये अग्रिम

(ii) Advances to the State Governments State P.W.Ds for repairs and maintenance etc. of :—

नियम के कार्यालयों (स्टाफ क्वार्टरों सहित) के लिये इमारतें

(a) Building for offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters)—	—	1,67,325	—	2,50,000	8,964	65,036	74,000	1,50,000
---	---	----------	---	----------	-------	--------	--------	----------

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
चिकित्सालय तथा औषधालय उप-भवन (b) Hospitals & Dispensaries/Annexes		18,572	12,195	20,33,881	5,50,000	3,62,903	2,32,097	5,95,000	7,00,000
विविध (iii) Miscellaneous		1,93,195	1,25,112	1,77,870	3,00,000	97,406	52,594	1,50,000	2,00,000
अग्रिमों का योग TOTAL ADVANCES		11,60,095	15,40,124	36,96,895	26,15,000	16,89,168	8,55,332	25,44,500	28,56,500
प्रेषित धन (सूद्ध) REMITTANCES (net) :									
नकद प्रेषित धन Cash Remittances		2,54,754	—	6,87,455	42,00,000	89,71,276	(—)64,71,276	25,00,000	27,00,000
अन्य प्रेषित धन Other Remittances		4,695	—	—	16,00,000	—	5,00,000	5,00,000	6,00,000
प्रेषित धन का योग TOTAL REMITTANCES		2,59,449	—	6,87,455	58,00,000	89,71,276	(—)59,71,276	30,00,000	33,00,000
कुल—ऋण, जमा अग्रिम और प्रेषित धन Total-Debt, Deposits, Advances and Remittances		3,12,52,049	(—)2,95,27,174	2,01,93,087	7,36,98,800	2,27,09,705	6,82,48,095	9,09,57,800	10,38,12,100
कुल आय TOTAL RECEIPTS		41,42,86,095	46,64,61,674	55,60,54,783	63,99,57,800	41,39,55,588	28,35,34,212	69,74,89,800	76,00,17,100
प्रारम्भिक योग Opening Balance		3,54,20,573	4,06,79,540	4,65,46,749	4,90,64,249	4,14,34,495	—	4,14,34,495	5,18,49,195
महा योग GRAND TOTAL		44,97,06,668	50,71,41,214	60,26,01,532	68,90,22,049	45,53,90,083	28,35,34,212	73,89,24,295	81,18,66,295
राजस्व लेखा पर व्यय EXPENDITURE ON REVENUE ACCOUNT									
बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों तथा उनके परिवारों को हितलाभ Benefits to Insured Persons & their families.									
अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ A—MEDICAL BENEFITS									
निम्नलिखित के लिये निगम के अंश की राज्य सरकारों को अदायगी :- Payments to State Governments etc. as Corporations' share of their expenses on providing :-									
चिकित्सा देख-रेख उपचार तथा मातृत्व सुविधाएं (a) Medical Care, treatment and Maternity facilities.									
वर्ष के अन्तर्गत व्यय (i) Expenditure during the year		14,42,32,703	13,73,35,901	16,09,79,000	19,07,46,000	3,74,53,507	16,62,50,493	18,63,99,000	22,63,40,000
पिछले वर्ष का दायित्व (ii) Past years' Liabilities		—	—	—	—	—		1,73,05,000	4,09,97,000

चिकित्सा उपचार व देख-रेख तथा मातृत्व
मुविधायें (निगम द्वारा सीधे ही वहन किया
गया व्यय)

(b) Medical treatment & care &
Maternity facilities (expenses
directly incurred by the Cor-
poration

73,98,467

75,34,675

93,37,811

96,68,000

63,81,329

36,51,671

1,00,33,000

1,10,25,000

योग—अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ

TOTAL—A—MEDICAL BENEFITS.

15,16,31,170

14,48,70,576

17,03,16,811

20,04,14,000

4,38,34,836

16,99,02,164

21,37,37,000

27,83,62,000

ब- नकद लाभ

B—CASH BENEFITS.

बीमारी हितलाभ

(i) Sickness Benefit

11,62,25,881

13,71,00,949

13,69,64,114

16,37,62,000

6,28,02,373

3,51,29,627

9,79,32,000

10,56,80,000

विस्तारित बीमारी हितलाभ

(ii) Extended Sickness Benefit

96,31,862

1,00,86,820

1,04,54,682

1,13,08,000

69,43,435

37,57,565

1,07,01,000

1,12,65,000

मातृत्व हितलाभ

(iii) Maternity Benefit

61,02,649

60,23,031

64,54,499

63,42,000

45,61,761

25,37,239

70,99,000

76,40,000

अस्थायी अप्रगता हितलाभ

(iv) Temporary Disablement
Benefit

1,96,16,014

2,89,90,066

3,02,26,619

3,54,33,000

1,34,01,622

74,80,378

2,08,82,000

2,43,01,000

स्थायी अप्रगता हितलाभ

(v) Permanent Disablement
Benefit

2,40,03,000

3,16,94,000

2,14,37,135

3,80,50,000

1,43,77,362

1,51,08,638

2,94,86,000

3,48,70,000

आश्रित जन हितलाभ

(vi) Dependent's Benefit

49,79,000

66,59,000

41,98,506

81,11,000

24,17,911

48,03,089

72,21,000

85,81,000

अन्त्येष्टि हितलाभ

(vii) Funeral Benefit

7,26,322

7,84,637

8,00,982

9,11,000

5,41,774

3,07,226

8,49,000

8,92,000

योग ब—नकद लाभ

TOTAL B-CASH BENEFITS

18,12,84,728

22,13,38,503

21,05,36,537

26,39,17,000

10,50,46,238

6,91,23,762

17,41,70,000

19,32,29,000

स-अन्य लाभ

C—OTHER BENEFITS.

बीमाकृत अप्रग व्यक्तियों के पुनर्वास पर व्यय

(a) Expenditure on the rehabili-
tation of disabled Insured Per-
sons

79,693

25,875

34,538

52,500

11,239

23,761

35,000

41,500

चिकित्सा मण्डल व अपील अधिकरण

(b) Medical Boards & Appeal
Tribunals

1,71,216

2,31,843

3,06,670

3,45,500

1,73,262

98,738

2,72,000

3,09,000

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
बीमाकृत व्यक्तियों को भुगतान :-									
(c) Payments to Insured persons :-									
मजदूरी की हानि तथा/या सवारी शुल्क									
(i) Conveyance charges &/or Loss of wages		1,15,854	1,22,746	1,24,167	1,53,000	72,583	42,417	1,15,000	1,37,500
परिवार नियोजन के अन्तर्गत प्रासंगिक व्यय									
(ii) Incidental charges under family planning		2,12,308	316	(—)15
सहायना अनुदान									
(d) Grant-in-aid	1,00,939	3,99,061	5,00,000	..
विविध									
(e) Miscellaneous		2,98,023	2,99,021	2,92,698	3,64,000	1,72,774	1,27,226	3,00,000	3,35,000
कुल से-अन्य लाभ									
TOTAL—C—OTHER BENEFITS		8,77,094	6,79,801	7,58,058	9,15,000	5,30,797	6,91,203	12,22,000	8,23,000
कुल शीर्ष- I—हितलाभ									
TOTAL OF HEAD—I—BENEFITS		33,37,92,992	36,68,88,880	38,16,11,406	46,52,46,000	14,94,11,871	23,97,17,129	38,91,29,000	47,24,14,000
प्रशासन व्यय									
2. ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES :									
अ-अधीक्षण									
A—SUPERINTENDENCE									
निगम, स्थाई समिति, क्षेत्रीय मण्डल आदि									
का याता भत्ता आदि।									
Corporation, Standing Committee, Regional Boards, etc.—T.A.		32,136	39,525	42,658	60,000	33,105	57,895	91,000	83,000
प्रधान अधिकारी									
PRINCIPAL OFFICERS									
प्रधान अधिकारियों का वेतन									
(i) Pay of Principal Officers		1,07,901	97,603	96,362	1,25,000	90,517	31,483	1,22,000	1,26,000
भत्ता तथा मानदेय									
(ii) Allowance & Honoraria		69,823	51,414	48,525	65,000	61,608	8,392	70,000	65,000
कुल प्रधान अधिकारी									
TOTAL PRINCIPAL OFFICERS		1,77,724	1,49,017	1,44,887	1,90,000	1,52,125	39,875	1,92,000	1,91,000
अन्य अधिकारी									
OTHER OFFICERS									
अन्य अधिकारियों का वेतन									
(i) Pay of other officers		13,41,345	15,38,975	14,58,255	15,98,000	10,82,758	4,57,242	15,40,000	16,68,000
भत्ता व मानदेय									
(ii) Allowances & Honoraria		7,34,395	8,97,916	9,92,685	11,94,000	7,50,660	3,87,340	11,38,000	15,61,000

कुल अन्य अधिकारी TOTAL OTHER OFFICERS	20,75,740	24,36,891	24,50,940	27,92,000	18,33,418	8,44,582	26,78,000	32,29,000
प्रभियन्ता कोष्ठ पर प्रशासन व्यय ADMINISTRATION EXPENDITURE ON ENGG. CELL	(—)1,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
लिपिक वर्गीय स्थापना MINISTERIAL ESTABLISHMENT								
स्थापना का वेतन (i) Pay of Establishment	39,81,075	41,77,369	43,96,076	50,88,000	35,64,532	15,11,468	50,76,000	55,80,000
भत्ता व मानदेय (ii) Allowances & Honoraria	50,67,058	61,37,808	66,93,598	74,80,000	57,56,727	25,36,273	82,93,000	1,09,17,000
कुल लिपिक वर्गीय स्थापना TOTAL MINISTERIAL ESTABLISHMENT	90,48,133	1,03,15,177	1,10,89,674	1,25,68,000	93,21,259	40,47,741	1,33,69,000	1,64,97,000
चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी CLASS IV SERVANTS								
चतुर्थ श्रेणी के कर्मचारियों का वेतन (i) Pay of Class IV Servants	6,29,862	6,39,218	6,56,935	7,43,000	5,09,228	2,18,772	7,28,000	7,62,000
भत्ता तथा मानदेय (ii) Allowances & Honoraria	9,86,610	11,46,411	12,68,174	14,23,000	10,21,209	4,47,791	14,69,000	19,35,000
कुल चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी TOTAL CLASS IV SERVANTS	16,16,472	17,85,629	19,25,109	21,66,000	15,30,437	6,66,563	21,97,000	26,97,000
आकस्मिक व्यय CONTINGENCIES								
डाक, तार व टेलीफोन व्यय (a) Postage, Telegram & Telephone charges	4,56,588	4,87,747	6,16,971	6,00,000	4,27,150	2,83,850	7,11,000	7,24,000
लेख सामग्री व फार्म (b) Stationery and Forms	10,51,982	11,06,085	14,22,706	21,50,000	12,07,994	16,42,006	28,50,000	24,90,000
प्रदान टिकट (c) Contribution Stamps	3,09,580	1,96,780	1,78,777	3,00,000	1,58,540	2,01,460	3,60,000	3,50,000
टाइपराइटर व अनुलिपिक आदि का क्रयण, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण (d) Purchase, Repair & Maintenance of Typewriters, Duplicators etc.	20,072	40,583	49,678	70,000	24,175	72,825	97,000	76,000
एड्रेमा उपकरण का क्रयण, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आदि। (e) Purchase, Repair & Maintenance etc. of Adrema equipments	2,13,624	1,47,463	99,268	3,00,000	99,067	69,933	1,69,000	2,21,000

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
किराया, महसूल व कर									
(f) Rents, Rates and Taxes		3,82,135	3,47,802	4,58,170	5,00,000	4,27,993	2,38,007	6,66,000	5,96,000
उपस्कर									
(g) Furniture		51,252	36,558	41,454	90,000	78,376	1,07,624	1,86,000	99,000
अभिलेख के लिये विशेष उपस्कर									
(h) Special equipments for records		11,652	34,452	923	94,000	75,126	1,17,874	1,93,000	66,000
कार्यालय के प्रयोग की सामान्य वस्तुओं का क्रयण, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आदि।									
(i) Purchase, Repair & Maintenance etc. of General Articles of office use		57,920	81,103	1,05,378	1,60,000	1,18,806	1,42,194	2,61,000	1,74,000
साइकिलों का क्रयण, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण									
(j) Purchase, Repair & Maintenance of Cycles		862	334	697	2,000	770	2,230	3,000	2,000
वेश-भूषा का क्रयण, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण									
(k) Purchase, Repair & Maintenance of Liveries		45,926	59,043	93,574	75,000	59,308	55,692	1,15,000	92,000
पुस्तकें, पत्रिकाएँ तथा अन्य प्रकाशन									
(l) Books, Periodicals and other Publications		10,646	12,149	11,300	16,000	6,618	9,382	16,000	18,000
गर्म व मर्द मौसम का खर्च									
(m) Hot & Cold weather charges		8,673	4,779	8,750	15,000	4,754	4,246	9,000	19,000
विविध :—									
(n) Miscellaneous :—									
कर्मचारी वर्ग की सुख सुविधा									
(i) Amenities of staff		22,080	21,004	30,746	4,00,000	19,619	1,62,187	3,24,000	2,66,000
विविध									
(ii) Miscellaneous		1,60,137	1,90,121	2,24,776		1,42,194			
स्टाफ्कारों की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण									
(o) Repair & Maintenance of staff cars		32,654	31,924	52,900	55,000	48,920	30,080	79,000	90,000
कुल आकस्मिक व्यय									
TOTAL CONTINGENCIES		28,35,783	27,97,927	33,96,068	48,27,000	28,99,410	31,39,590	60,39,000	52,83,000
कुल अ-अधीक्षण ¹									
TOTAL A-SUPERINTENDENCE		1,57,84,988	1,75,24,166	1,90,49,336	2,26,03,000	1,57,69,753	87,56,247	2,45,66,000	2,79,80,000

ब-क्षेत्रीय कार्य

B-FIELD WORK

अधिकारीगण
OFFICERS

अधिकारियों का वेतन

(i) Pay of Officers	3,69,812	4,07,226	3,89,894	4,44,000	3,13,946	1,44,054	4,58,000	5,20,000
-----------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

भत्ता व मानदेय

(ii) Allowances & Honoraria . .	1,86,498	2,56,519	2,52,056	2,80,000	2,09,213	1,14,787	3,24,000	4,50,000
---------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

कुल अधिकारी

TOTAL OFFICERS	5,56,310	6,63,745	6,41,950	7,24,000	5,23,159	2,58,841	7,82,000	9,70,000
------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

लिपिक वर्गीय स्थापना

MINISTERIAL ESTABLISHMENT

लिपिक वेतन

(i) Pay of establishment	52,93,085	54,79,365	59,21,614	65,97,000	44,86,352	18,25,648	63,12,000	67,08,000
----------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

भत्ता व मानदेय

(ii) Allowances & Honoraria . .	53,74,136	65,21,815	72,35,564	81,01,000	56,67,658	22,77,342	79,45,000	1,02,45,000
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------------

योग लिपिक वर्गीय स्थापना

TOTAL MINISTERIAL ESTABLISHMENT

	1,06,57,221	1,20,01,780	1,31,57,178	1,46,98,000	1,01,54,010	41,02,990	1,42,57,000	1,69,53,000
--	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-----------	-------------	-------------

चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी

CLASS IV SERVANTS

चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारीगण का वेतन

(i) Pay of Class IV Servants . .	8,24,504	8,23,795	8,31,380	9,12,000	6,12,478	2,92,522	9,05,000	9,57,000
----------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

भत्ता व मानदेय

(ii) Allowances & Honoraria . .	10,54,262	12,79,386	13,55,894	15,57,000	10,55,340	5,21,660	15,77,000	20,98,000
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	-----------	-----------

कुल चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी

TOTAL CLASS IV SERVANTS . .	18,78,766	21,03,181	21,87,274	24,69,000	16,67,818	8,14,182	24,82,000	30,55,000
-----------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	-----------	-----------

आकस्मिक व्यय

CONTINGENCIES

डाक, तार व टेलीफोन खर्च

(a) Postage, Telegram & Telephone charges	2,19,843	2,17,476	2,48,321	3,30,000	1,73,112	1,35,888	3,09,000	3,31,000
---	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

लेखनसामग्री व फार्म

(b) Stationery & Forms	8,245	10,657	13,867	35,000	9,258	26,742	36,000	44,000
--------------------------------	-------	--------	--------	--------	-------	--------	--------	--------

टाइपराइटर व मनुलिपिक का क्रयण, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण

(c) Purchase, Repair & Maintenance of Typewriter, Duplicators etc.	20,234	9,489	22,054	72,000	8,834	60,166	69,000	72,000
--	--------	-------	--------	--------	-------	--------	--------	--------

किराया, महसूल व कर

(d) Rents, Rates & Taxes	9,59,305	9,56,573	10,42,040	12,54,000	7,70,669	5,77,331	13,48,000	14,14,000
----------------------------------	----------	----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	-----------	-----------

उपस्कर

(e) Furniture	22,311	24,466	28,903	1,46,000	31,180	1,73,820	2,05,000	1,50,000
-------------------------	--------	--------	--------	----------	--------	----------	----------	----------

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
	अभिलेख के लिए विशेष उपस्कर								
(f)	Special equipments for records कार्यालय के प्रयोग के लिये सामान्य पदार्थों का क्रयण, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण	8,393	6,346	3,169	95,000	7,383	1,18,617	1,26,000	1,24,000
(g)	Purchase, Repairs & Maintenance etc. of General Articles of Office use	20,626	19,814	29,261	84,000	15,511	1,06,489	1,22,000	94,000
	साइकिलों का क्रयण, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण								
(h)	Purchase, Repairs & Maintenance of Cycles	6,940	1,633	1,548	11,000	1,571	10,429	12,000	7,000
	वेश-भूषा का क्रयण, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण								
(i)	Purchase, Repairs & Maintenance of Liveries	23,643	18,179	22,407	50,000	8,518	41,482	50,000	54,000
	पुस्तकें, पत्रिकाएँ तथा अन्य प्रकाशन								
(j)	Books, Periodicals and other Publications	200	178	109	4,000	87	3,413	3,500	5,000
	गर्म व मर्द मौसम का खर्च								
(k)	Hot & Cold weather charges	7,469	5,012	10,368	25,000	9,657	14,843	24,500	24,000
	विविध —								
(l)	Miscellaneous:—								
	कर्मचारियों की सुख सुविधाएँ								
	(i) Amenities of the staff	706	530	300	3,50,000	1,439	1,05,148	2,95,000	2,99,000
	विविध					1,88,413			
	(ii) Miscellaneous	2,21,363	2,34,593	2,60,012					
	योग आकस्मिक व्यय								
	TOTAL CONTINGENCIES	15,19,278	15,04,946	16,82,359	24,56,000	12,25,682	13,74,368	26,00,000	26,18,000
	कुल ब—क्षेत्रीय कार्य								
	TOTAL B—FIELD WORKS	1,46,21,575	1,62,73,652	1,76,68,761	2,03,47,000	1,35,70,619	65,50,381	2,01,21,000	2,35,96,000
	स—अन्य खर्च								
	C—OTHER CHARGES								
	विधि खर्च								
	Legal charges	1,74,275	1,71,986	2,03,825	2,40,000	1,11,990	1,41,010	2,53,000	2,52,000
	बीमा अदालतें								
	Insurance Courts	1,12,857	60,000	..	2,50,000	2,50,000	60,000
	प्रचार व विज्ञापन								
	Publicity & Advertisement	5,984	6,598	31,579	65,000	27,617	69,383	97,000	31,000
	बैंक लेखा रखने का खर्च								
	Charges for maintaining Banking A/cs	7,305	37,358	82,222	1,15,000	65,157	81,843	1,47,000	60,000

छुट्टी व पेंशन अंशदान Leave & Pension Contributions	83,472	1,26,961	1,14,180	83,000	63,389	53,611	1,17,000	85,000
लेखा परीक्षण शुल्क Audit Fees	42,103	83,590	91,184	1,00,000	..	95,000	95,000	1,00,000
मरम्मत, अनुरक्षण व मूल्यह्रास आदि Repairs, Maintenance & Depreciation etc.								
नियम के कार्यालयों की इमारतों (स्टाफ क्वार्टरों सहित) का मूल्यह्रास (a) Depreciation of Buildings for the offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters)	1,45,860	1,48,616	1,48,404	1,50,000	..	1,50,000	1,50,000	1,60,000
स्टाफ कारों का मूल्यह्रास (b) Depreciation of Staff Cars	21,975	22,719	24,644	25,000	.	34,000	34,000	23,000
नियम के कार्यालयों की इमारतों (स्टाफ क्वार्टरों सहित) की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण (c) Repairs & Maintenance of Buildings for the offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters)	4,20,700	4,28,693	4,28,078	4,30,000	52,153	3,77,847	4,30,000	4,50,000
निवृत्ति हितलाभ RETIREMENT BENEFITS								
पेंशन आरक्षित निधि के लिए निगम का अंशदान (a) Corporation's Contribution towards Pension Reserve Fund	55,78,500	21,70,700	97,36,419	27,69,000	1,62,114	23,57,886	25,20,000	27,60,000
कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम भविष्य के लिए निगम का अंशदान (b) Corporation's Contribution to ESIC Contributory Provident Fund	2,15,290	2,06,610	2,22,447	2,25,000	..	2,25,000	2,25,000	2,25,000
कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम भविष्य निधि/अंशदायी भविष्य निधि को अदा किया गया व्याज Interest paid to ESIC Provident Fund/Contributory Provident Fund	1,98,753	2,40,228	2,84,784	3,20,000	..	3,20,000	3,20,000	3,30,000
सामान्य भविष्य निधि General Provident Fund	4,21,480	5,22,989	6,27,204	7,00,000	..	7,40,000	7,40,000	10,00,000
कम . Deduct :								
भविष्य निधि के अवशेषों के विनियोजन पर उपचित और/या वसूल किया गया व्याज Interest accrued and/or realised on investment of Provident Fund balances.	(-4,75,981	(-7,91,495	(-9,76,653	(-12,31,000	(-9,49,770	(-3,41,230	(-12,91,000	(-16,37,000

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
निगम के कर्मचारियों के लिये अनुकंपा आरक्षित निधि									
Compassionate Reserve Fund for the employees of the Corporation.		700	1,230	2,634	5,000	2,300	2,200	4,500	6,000
विविध									
Miscellaneous		8	16,688	8	10,000	46,906	(—)22,406	24,500	20,000
योग-स- अन्य खर्च									
TOTAL C—OTHER CHARGES		69,53,281	33,93,471	1,10,20,959	40,66,000	(—)4,18,144	45,34,144	41,16,000	39,25,000
शीर्ष-2 प्रशासन व्यय का योग									
TOTAL OF HEAD-2 ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES		3,73,59,844	3,71,91,289	4,77,39,056	4,70,16,000	2,89,22,229	1,98,80,771	4,88,03,000	5,55,01,000
चिकित्सालय व औषधालय तथा संचित दायित्व आदि									
3. HOSPITALS, DISPENSARIES AND ACCUMULATED LIABILITIES ETC.									
चिकित्सालयों व औषधालयों की मरम्मत अनुरक्षण व मूल्यहास आदि									
Repair, Maintenance and Depreciation etc. of Hospitals and Dispensaries :—									
चिकित्सालयों की इमारतों व उपकरणों का मूल्यहास									
(a) Depreciation of Hospital Buildings and Equipments.		15,18,356	16,39,457	16,45,619	16,50,000	—	23,27,000	23,27,000	25,00,000
चिकित्सालयों के भवनों की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण									
(b) Repair & Maintenance of Hospital Buildings.		43,45,746	47,17,209	47,09,216	47,20,000	4,29,815	62,37,185	66,67,000	70,00,000
पूँजीगत निर्माण/चिकित्सा (संचित) दायित्व आदि									
(c) Capital Construction/Medical (Accumulated) liabilities etc.		—	3,69,64,000	4,04,35,000	4,30,00,000	—	4,60,00,000	4,60,00,000	5,00,00,000
योग शीर्ष-3-चिकित्सालय, औषधालय तथा चिकित्सा (संचित) दायित्व आदि									
TOTAL HEAD-3 HOSPITALS, DISPENSARIES & MEDICAL (ACCUMULATED) LIABILITIES ETC.		58,64,102	4,33,20,666	4,67,89,835	4,93,70,000	4,29,815	5,45,64,185	5,49,94,000	5,95,00,000
राजस्व लेखा पर कुल व्यय									
TOTAL EXPENDITURE ON REVENUE ACCOUNT		37,70,16,938	44,74,00,835	47,61,40,297	56,16,32,000	17,87,63,915	31,41,62,085	49,29,26,000	58,74,15,000

46 G of I/73-16.

4.	पूँजीगत लेखा पर व्यय EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCOUNT								
	भूमि व भवन A. LAND AND BUILDINGS								
	निम्नलिखित का क्रयण व निर्माण:— Purchase & Construction etc. of :—								
	निगम के कार्यालयों के भवन (स्टाफ क्वार्टर सहित)								
	(i) Building for the Offices of the Corporation (including staff quarters).	14,60,225	12,64,956	2,03,678	10,00,000	7,33,280	9,10,720	16,44,000	87,00,000
	चिकित्सालय तथा औषधालय (ii) Hospitals & Dispensaries	1,14,78,155	78,34,867	1,58,59,906	1,24,00,000	48,55,230	1,60,04,770	2,08,60,000	2,60,00,000
	चिकित्सालयों के लिये उपस्कर (iii) Equipments of Hospitals	2,35,878	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	ब—स्टाफ कारें B. STAFF CARS								
	स्टाफ कारों का क्रयण Purchase of Staff Cars	37,703	26,096	18,785	75,000	32,467	1,17,533	1,50,000	50,000
	योग शीर्ष-4—पूँजीगत लेखा पर व्यय TOTAL HEAD-4—EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCOUNT	1,32,11,961	91,25,917	1,60,82,369	1,34,75,000	56,20,977	1,70,33,023	2,26,54,000	3,47,50,000
	ऋण, जमा, अग्रिम व प्रेषित वन DEBT, DEPOSITS, ADVANCES & REMITTANCES								
	साधारण ऋण ORDINARY DEBT								
	राज्य सरकारों को ऋण Loans to State Governments	16,30,234	—	60,00,000	60,00,000	—	60,00,000	60,00,000	1,60,00,000
	निधि युक्त ऋण UNFUNDED DEBT								
	क० रा० बी० नि० भविष्य निधि अभिदाताओं को अदायगी ESIC PROVIDENT FUND								
	Payment to subscribers :—								
	सामान्य भविष्य निधि (i) General Provident Fund	20,18,991	19,68,294	24,46,643	26,00,000	20,16,402	12,33,598	32,50,000	35,00,000
	अंशदायी भविष्य निधि (ii) Contributory Provident Fund	3,41,805	4,51,112	4,75,249	5,00,000	3,67,742	2,32,258	6,00,000	6,50,000
	योग ऋण TOTAL DEBTS	39,91,030	24,19,406	89,21,892	91,00,000	23,84,144	74,65,856	98,50,000	2,01,50,000

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
जमा, अग्रिम व आरक्षित निधियाँ DEPOSITS, ADVANCES & RESERVE FUNDS									
नियम के कार्यालयों (स्टाफ क्वार्टरों सहित) की मूल्यहास आरक्षित निधि विनियोग लेखा/ वर्ष में विनियोजन									
Depreciation Reserve Fund of Buildings for the offices of Cor- poration (including staff qrs.) investment Account. Investment during the year.		1,85,363	6,73,880	7,92,595	2,28,000	—	2,21,300	2,21,300	2,68,000
कम—विनियोजन के बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली									
Deduct—Realisation on maturity or sale of investments.		(—)17,925	(—)4,85,601	(—)5,80,000	(—)9,000	—	—	—	(—)19,500
चिकित्सालयों तथा परीक्षण केन्द्रों के उपकरणों की मूल्यहास आरक्षित निधि विनियोग लेखा Depreciation Reserve Fund of equip- ments in Hospitals and Exami- nation Centres Investment A/c.									
वर्ष में विनियोजन									
Investments during the year		—	20,500	34,025	25,800	29,000	5,400	34,400	5,500
कम—बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली									
Deduct—Realisation on maturity or sale.		—	(—)10,000	(—)22,000	(—)22,000	(—)29,000	—	(—) 29,000	—
चिकित्सालयों की इमारतों की मूल्यहास आरक्षित निधि-विनियोग लेखा Depreciation Reserve Fund of Hos- pital Buildings Investment Acc- ount.									
वर्ष में विनियोग									
Investment during the year		17,07,615	59,51,700	62,07,300	29,28,000	6,38,000	29,79,000	36,17,000	3,81,000
कम—बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली									
Deduct—Realisation on maturity or sale		—	(—)39,08,227	(—)40,69,127	(—)6,38,000	(—)5,88,000	(—)50,000	(—)6,38,000	(—)4,37,000
स्वास्थ्य कारों की मूल्यहास आरक्षित निधि विनियोग लेखा Depreciation Reserve Fund of staff Cars Investments Account.									
वर्ष में विनियोजन									
Investments during the year		23,058	52,500	65,080	36,000	9,000	46,000	55,000	38,300

कम: बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली Deduct : Realisation on maturity or sale.	—	(—)21,000	(—)30,062	—	(—)9,000	—	(—)9,000	—
निगम के कार्यालयों की इमारतों (स्टाफ क्वार्टरों सहित) की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आरक्षित निधि—विनियोग लेखा । Repairs & Maintenance Reserve Fund of Buildings for the Offices of the Corporation (including staff Qrs.) Investment Account.								
वर्ष में विनियोजन Investments during the year . . .	1,43,939	3,93,700	9,79,400	2,02,000	—	2,72,000	2,72,000	2,11,000
कम—बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली Deduct : Realisation on Maturity or sale.	(—)20,475	(—)2,67,290	(—)7,28,371	—	—	—	—	—
चिकित्सालय के भवनों की मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आरक्षित निधि—विनियोग लेखा । Repair & Maintenance Reserve Fund of Hospital Buildings Investment A/c.								
वर्ष में विनियोग Investments during the year . . .	40,61,565	79,00,000	1,88,21,600	11,92,000	11,92,000	41,61,400	53,53,400	82,02,400
कम—बिक्री व परिपाक पर वसूली Deduct : Realisation on maturity or sale.	—	(—)38,00,000	(—)1,42,47,302	(—)11,92,000	(—)11,92,000	—	(—)11,92,000	(—)38,00,700
स्थाई (आंशिक तथा पूर्ण) अपंगता हितलाभ आरक्षित निधि—विनियोग लेखा Permanent (Partial & Total) Disablement Benefit Reserve Fund Investment Account								
वर्ष में विनियोजन Investments during the year . . .	86,93,075	1,50,43,000	4,04,97,000	1,88,22,000	4,00,000	1,07,21,000	1,11,21,000	2,49,46,000
कम—बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली Deduct : Realisation on maturity or sale	—	(—)50,21,225	(—)3,13,57,837	(—)4,00,000	(—)4,00,000	—	(—)4,00,000	(—)99,63,000
आश्रितजन हितलाभ आरक्षित निधि—विनियोग लेखा Dependants, Benefit Reserve Fund Investment Account								
वर्ष में विनियोजन Investments during the year . . .	40,26,075	89,31,700	1,72,54,800	1,38,57,000	73,29,000	58,28,000	1,31,57,000	76,38,300
कम—बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली Deduct : Realisation on maturity or sale	—	(—)35,78,947	(—)1,44,51,664	(—)73,36,000	(—)73,29,000	—	(—)73,29,000	(—)2,74,300

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
निगम के कर्मचारियों को पेंशन आरक्षित निधि विनियोग लेखा Pension Reserve Fund for the employees of the Corporation Investment account.									
वर्ष में विनियोग Investments during the year . . .		60,31,683	96,48,300	2,49,09,700	49,77,000	5,20,400	44,71,600	49,92,000	50,92,500
कम—बिक्री या परिपाक पर वसूली Deduct : Realisation on maturity or sale		(—)48,000	(—)63,32,088	(—)1,36,09,229	(—)4,70,000	(—)5,85,400	1,15,400	(—)4,70,000	(—)1,96,500
क० रा० बी० नि० भविष्य निधि विनियोग लेखा E.S.I.C. Provident Fund Investment account									
वर्ष में विनियोजन Investments during the year . . .		19,50,000	57,56,900	90,35,400	36,45,000	11,21,000	27,07,000	38,28,000	56,57,400
कम—परिपाक व बिक्री पर वसूली Deduct : Realisation on maturity or sale.		(—)3,90,000	(—)35,96,891	(—)65,78,262	(—)13,00,000	(—)10,63,900	3,20,900	(—)7,43,000	(—)30,02,400
योग आरक्षित निधि TOTAL RESERVE FUNDS : .		2,63,45,973	2,73,50,911	3,29,23,046	3,45,45,800	42,100	3,17,99,000	3,18,41,100	3,81,97,000
जमा DEPOSITS.									
जमागत जमा									
Deposits of Securities . . .		79,832	85,422	82,775	1,00,000	82,965	57,035	1,40,000	1,50,000
अन्य जमा (शुद्ध) Other Deposits (Net) . . .									
		32,448	—	—	22,00,000	—	10,00,000	10,00,000	10,00,000
कुल जमा TOTAL DEPOSITS . . .		1,12,280	85,422	82,775	23,00,000	82,965	10,57,035	11,40,000	11,50,000
अग्रिम निधि ADVANCES :									
स्थायी अग्रिम									
(a) Permanent Advances		2,145	1,805	4,145	6,000	1,100	2,900	4,000	7,000
निगम के कर्मचारियों के लिये अग्रिम									
(b) Advances to employees of the Corporation.									
स्थानान्तरण पर अग्रिम वेतन									
(i) Advance of pay on transfer.		62,769	74,572	1,03,354	1,10,000	57,144	52,856	1,10,000	1,20,000
स्थानान्तरण पर अग्रिम यात्रा भत्ता									
(ii) Advance of T. A. on transfer.		66,203	1,00,161	1,31,140	1,35,000	68,973	51,027	1,20,000	1,30,000

मोटर वाहन के क्रय के लिये अग्रिम राजि								
(iii) Advance for the purchase of Motor Conveyances.	3,86,747	4,11,380	2,92,520	5,00,000	1,59,810	3,40,190	5,00,000	6,00,000
अन्य वाहन के क्रय के लिये अग्रिम राजि								
(iv) Advance for the purchase of other conveyances.	2,01,157	2,23,005	1,87,417	2,60,000	1,82,655	67,345	2,50,000	2,80,000
मकान निर्माण अग्रिम राजि								
(v) House Building Advances.	90,556	2,74,127	3,57,237	15,00,000	6,17,359	8,82,641	15,00,000	15,00,000
विविध								
(vi) Miscellaneous.	4,47,152	9,44,550	11,53,486	5,50,000	2,73,911	2,76,089	5,50,000	6,30,000
स—अन्य अग्रिम राजि								
C—OTHER ADVANCES :								
राज्य सरकारों को ओर से अग्रिम अदायगी								
(i) Advance payments on behalf of State Governments.	4,830	4,387	4,478	5,000	2,826	2,174	5,000	6,000
राज्य सरकारों/राज्य लोक निर्माण विभागों को मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आदि के लिये अग्रिम								
(ii) Advances to the State Governments/ State P.W.D's. for repair & Maintenance etc. of :-								
नगर के कार्यालय के भवन (स्टाफ क्वार्टरों सहित)								
(a) Buildings for offices of the Corporation. (including staff quarters).	3,69,574	1,00,656	1,19,863	3,00,000	93,982	70,018	1,64,000	2,00,000
चिकित्सालय व औषधालय/उपभवन								
(b) Hospitals & Dispensaries/Annexes.	4,46,945	13,52,978	17,58,649	60,00,000	26,05,212	5,75,788	31,81,000	35,00,000
विविध								
(iii) Miscellaneous.	51,579	3,74,778	2,88,016	4,00,000	1,67,448	1,12,552	2,80,000	3,20,000
कुल अग्रिम राजि								
TOTAL ADVANCES :	21,29,657	38,62,399	44,00,305	97,66,000	42,30,420	24,33,580	66,64,000	72,93,000
प्रेषित धन (शुद्ध)								
REMITTANCES (Net.)								
नकद प्रेषित धन								
(i) Cash Remittances.	—	4,86,254	—	42,00,000	—	25,00,000	25,00,000	27,00,000
अन्य प्रेषित धन								
(ii) Other Remittances.	—	2,403	8,553	16,00,000	6,43,030	(—)1,43,030	5,00,000	6,00,000
कुल प्रेषित धन								
TOTAL REMITTANCES :		4,88,657	8,553	58,00,000	6,43,030	23,56,970	30,00,000	33,00,000
योग ऋण, जमा, अग्रिम राजि व प्रेषित धन								
TOTAL DEBT DEPOSITS								
ADVANCES AND REMITTANCES.	3,25,78,940	3,42,06,795	4,63,36,571	6,51,11,800	73,82,659	4,51,12,441	5,24,95,100	7,00,90,000

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
कुल सवितरण									
TOTAL DISBURSEMENT		42,28,07,839	49,07,33,547	53,85,59,237	63,66,18,800	19,17,67,551	37,63,07,549	56,80,75,100	69,22,55,000
समाप्य नकद लाभ									
GENERAL CASH BALANCES									
वर्ष में वित्तियोजन									
Investment during the year.		5,39,18,227	4,91,64,500	23,00,07,800	20,00,00,000	27,35,00,000	26,90,00,000	54,25,00,000	55,00,00,000
कम-परिपाक या बिक्री पर वसूली									
Deduct : Realisation on maturity or sale.		(—)6,76,98,938	(—)7,93,03,582	(—)26,64,00,000	(—)20,00,00,000	(—)4,90,00,000	(—)37,45,00,000	(—)42,35,00,000	(—)47,42,50,000
नकद अतिशेष	}								
CASH BALANCES									
हाथ में रोकड़									
(i) Cash-in-hand		4,06,79,540	4,65,46,749	4,14,34,495	5,24,03,249	3,91,22,532	1,27,26,663	5,18,49,195	4,38,61,295
बैंकर के पास रोकड़									
(ii) Cash with Bankers.									
महायोग									
GRAND TOTAL :		44,97,06,668	50,71,41,214	60,26,01,532	68,90,22,049	45,53,90,083	20,35,34,212	73,89,24,295	81,18,66,295

टिप्पणी—जिन विस्तृत शीर्षों में आंकड़े नहीं हैं वे लुप्त कर दिष्टे गये हैं।

N. B. : The detailed heads under which no figure appears have been omitted.

कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम

परिशिष्ट 1

APPENDIX-I

EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION

उन स्थानों की सूची जिनमें 1972-73 तक योजना का प्रसारण किया गया था

List of Places where the Scheme was Anticipated to be Extended upto the end of 1972-73.

राज्य/केन्द्र	कर्मचारियों की संख्या (परिशोधित)	केवल बीमाकृत कर्मचारियों के लिये For Insured Employees only,	बीमाकृत कर्मचारियों के परिवारों के लिये For families of Insured Employees.	प्रसारण की तिथि	प्रसारण की तिथि
State/Centre.	No. of Employees (Revised)	Date of Extension of originally anticipated.	Actual/anticipated date of extension	Date of Extension originally anticipated.	Actual/anticipated date of extension
1	2	3	4	5	6
आन्ध्र प्रदेश ANDHRA PRADESH					
श्रीराम नगर तथा रामचन्द्रपुरम Sriramnagar & Rama chandrapuram.	4,300	October, 1971	December, 1972	January, 1972	March, 1973
सीमेंट नगर Cement Nagar.	400	-do-	June, 1972	-do-	September, 1973
यमीगनूर तथा विशाखापट्टम Yamiganur & Vishakhapatnam.	5,950	-do-	Not anticipated.	-do-	Not anticipated
मन्चेरियल Mancheria	800	-do-	Not anticipated	-do-	Not anticipated
महबूब नगर, गोपालापट्टनम, विजयपुरी, घाटकेसर और हैदराबाद (उपगत) Mehboob Nagar, Gopalpatnam, Vijaypuri, Ghatkesar & Hyderabad (out-skirts)	2,700	June, 1972	April, 1973	September, 1972	July, 1973.
आसाम ASSAM					
पानिकाटी सहित चन्द्रपुर, चैरापुजी, डिगबोई मारघेरिता, नामरूप, शिलोंग तथा सिलचर Chandrapur includes Panikhati, Charrapunji, Digboi, Margherita, Namrup, Shillong and Silchar	8,200	July, 1972	May, 1973	October, 1972	August, 1973
बिहार BIHAR					
अदित्यपुर Adityapur	2,500	October, 1971	1-10-1972	January, 1972	1-1-1973
मैथन Maithon	500	-do-	July, 1973	January, 1972	October, 1973
छोटामूरी, बरकाकान तथा गोमिया Chotamuri, Barkakana and Gomia	4,050	November, 1971	July, 1973	February, 1972	October, 1973
बनियादीह, बन्सजोरा, बरौनी दोकारों चन्द्रपुरा, धुरावा, दुग्दा, घाटशिला, हैसला, झोंकपाणी, कठारा कटरासगढ़, खलारी और मित्तरी । Banianih, Bansjora, Barauni, Bokaro, Chandrapura, Dhurwa, Dugda, Ghatsila, Hesla, Jhink Pani, Kathara, Katrasgarh, Khalari & Sindri	48,050	August, 1972	July, 1973	November, 1972	October, 1 1973
दरभंगा, दुमरांग, कन्दरा, ओरामांझी तथा पठारदोह । Darbhanga, Dumraon, Kandra, Oramanji and Patharadih	4,100	August, 1972	Not anticipated	November, 1972	Not anticipated.

1	2	3	4	5	6
गुजरात GUJARAT					
अहमदाबाद (उपनगर) आनन्द, भुल, बजवा, बरेजादी भैली, विल्लोमोरे, बुलसर, चिखोदरा, देहगम पूवारन, द्वारका, दोहाद, हलोल, जूनगढ़, कौमालो, लिम्बदी, मेहसाना, मिथापुर नवमारो, रनबाड़, रनौली, सेवालिया, सिद्धपुर सिहोर, सिक्का, थानगड, वल्वा, वैरावल, धौर विरामगम करगल Ahmedabad, (Suburbs), Anand, Atul, Bajwa, Barejadi, Bhaili, Billimore, Bulsar, Chikhodra, Dehgam, Dhuvaran, Dwarka, Dohad, Halol, Junagarh, Koyali, Limbdi, Mehsana, Mitha- pur, Navsari, Ranavar, Ranoli, Sevalia, Sidh- pur, Sihor, Sikka, Thangarh, Valva, Veraval and Viramgam	77,600	September, 1972	July, 1973	December, 1972	October 1973
हरियाणा HARYANA					
करनाल Karnal	750	September, 1972	Not anticipated	December, 1972	Not anticipated
केरल Kerala					
मिलिया Melila	400	November, 1971	Not anticipated.	February, 1972	Not anticipated
मध्य प्रदेश MADAYA PRADESH					
नन्दिनी रोड Nandini Road	1,650	October, 1972	December, 1972	January, 1973	March, 1973
नेपानगर Nepanagar	2,800	October, 1972	June, 1973	January, 1973	September, 1973
भोपाल, पिपलानी, कतनी, काईमोरे, लाल खडान तथा सागर Bhopal, Piplani, Katni, Kymore, Lal Khadan & Sagar	47,000	October, 1972	August, 1973	January, 1973	November, 1973
महाराष्ट्र MAHARASHTRA					
खोपोली तथा औद्योगिक क्षेत्र शोलापुर Khopoli, Sholapur Industrial estate	20,000	November, 1971	June, 1973	February, 1972	September, 1973
चालीसगाव, धूलिया, तेलगाव, बल्लारपुर, मिराज, बरसी तथा इचालकरजी। Chalisgaon, Dhulia, Telegaon, Ballarpur, Miraj, Barsi & Ichalkaranji	12,300	November, 1971	Not anticipated	February, 1972	Not anticipated
भोरा, भोवपुरी, भूसावल, धनुरोड, माधवनगर, मोरा- उरान, मूरगुड, ओगलेवडी, श्रीरामपुर, टिकेकारवडी, चन्द्रपुर गोडिया, कन्हन, खमगाव, लाटूर, एम० आई० डी० सी० तथा वर्धा Bhira, Bhiypuri, Bhusawal, Dhanu Road, Madha- nagar, Mora-Uran, Murgud, Oglewadi, Shri- rampur, Tikekarwadi, Chandrapur, Gondia, Kanhana, Khamsaon, Latur, M.I.D.C. & Wardha	18,000	October, 1972	September, 1973	January, 1973	December, 1973
अहमदाबाद, भोर, कराड़, लोनावाला पंचोरा, रत्नगिरि, सतारा उचालपुर, अमरावती, खप्परखेड़ा और पारस Ahmednagar, Bhor, Karad, Lonawala, Pachora, Ratnagiri, Satara, Uchalpur, Amravati, Khaper- kheda and Paras	16,950	October, 1972	Not anticipated.	January, 1973	Not anticipated
मैसूर MYSORE					
नारगुड Nargund	1,160	October, 1971	December, 1972	January, 1972	March, 1973

1	2	3	4	5	6
भारतकोट Bagalkot	850	December, 1971	December, 1972	March, 1972	March, 1973
मुनीरबाद Munirabad	600	December, 1971	Not anticipated	March, 1972	Not anticipated
बेलागोला, भद्रावली, चन्नापटना, चित्रदुर्ग, कुन्दापुर Jagga, Shimoga, और बेदी Belagola, Bhadravathi, Channapatna, Chitradurga, Coondapur, Jogfall Shimoga & Wedi	17,650	November, 1971	December, 1972	February, 1973	March, 1973
धारवाड़, गदग तथा यमुनापुर। Dharwar, Gadag & Yamunapur.	2,100	November, 1972	Not anticipated.	February, 1973	Not anticipated
उड़ीसा ORISSA.					
बेहरामपुर Berhampur	1,250	October, 1971	25-11-1972	January, 1972	25-2-1973
राउकेला (हिन्दुस्तान स्टील लि० के एक्को के प्रतिरिक्त) Rourkela (excluding Units of Hindustan Steel).	1,800	October, 1971	December, 1972	January, 1972	March, 1973
हीराकुंड, लटकटा तथा बेलपहाड़। Hirakund, Latkata & Belpahar.	4,800	October, 1971	June, 1973	January, 1972	September, 1973
जगन्नाथपुर, जोदा, संबलपुर, सुनाबेदा, तथा तलचौर। Jagnathpur, Joda, Sambalpur, Sunabeda, & Talcher	5,050	November, 1972	October, 1973	February, 1973	January, 1974.
बारडोला Bardol	650	November, 1972	Not anticipated.	February, 1973	Not anticipated.
पंजाब PUNJAB.					
दीनानगर, जगतजीतनगर, मोगा, नंगल, संसारपुर और तलवाड़ा Dinanagar, Jagatjitnagar, Moga, Nangal, Sansar- pur and Talwara.	7,500	December, 1972	October, 1973	March, 1973	January, 1974.
राजस्थान RAJASTHAN					
डेवारी Debari	6,100	December, 1971	December, 1972	March, 1972	March, 1973
अलवर और चित्तौरगढ़ Alwar & Chittorgarh	2,400	December, 1972	December, 1972	March, 1973	March, 1973
काबले नगर तथा फलना Cable Nagar & Falna	1,300	December, 1972	October, 1973	March, 1973	January, 1974
तमिलनाडु TAMIL NADU					
कुमारपालायम तथा सानालपुरम Komarapalayam and Sanjalapuram	1,800	October, 1971	Not anticipated	January, 1972	Not anticipated
अरुमुगानेरी, सालेम (उपति) मेलूर Arumuganeri, Salem (suburbs) & Melur	2,400	November, 1971	June, 1973	February, 1972	September, 1973
अतूर, कुडालोरे, धारापुरम, नेवेली, कन्याकुमारी, नेवेली, पट्टीवीरानपट्टी, सन्कारी, सिक्कासी, श्रीविल्लुपुथुर, थिरुवाङ्गुर, थिरुवेन्गोडा, थिरुमंगलैम, थिरुवरामूर तथा वीरवाल्नूर। Attur, Cuddalore, Dharapuram, Kanyakumari, Neyveli, Pattivceranpatti, Sankari, Sivakasi, Srivilliputhur, Thanjavur, Thiruchengodu, Thiruvangalun, Thiruvaramour & Viravanallur.	20,600	December, 1972	October, 1973	March, 1973	January, 1974
करूर Karur	1,900	December, 1972	Not anticipated	March, 1973	Not anticipated

1	2	3	4	5
उत्तर प्रदेश UTTAR PRADESH				
रिश्किेश Rishikesh	4,500	December, 1971	June, 1973	March, 1972 September, 1973
निजीबाबाद Najibabad & Itawah.	1,400	December, 1971	Not anticipated	March, 1972 Not anticipated
फैजाबाद Faizabad	1,400	December, 1971	November, 1973	March, 1972 February, 1974
अकबरपुर (टांडा सहित), बहजोई, हल्द्वानी, खमारिया तथा सरदारनगर Akbarpur (includes Tanda), Bahjoi, Haldwani, Khamaria & Sardar Nagar.				
	3,250	December, 1972	November, 1973	March, 1973 February, 1974
भोदाल तथा पुतलीधर Bhadol & Putlighar	1,700	December, 1972	Not anticipated	March, 1973 Not anticipated
पश्चिमी बंगाल WEST BENGAL				
बाटा नगर Bata Nagar	12,100	December, 1972	June, 1973	March, 1973 September, 1973
आसनसोल Asansol	6,500	December, 1972	November, 1973	March, 1973 February, 1974
बोगरा, बर्नपुर, फरक्का, हरिषाटा जेकेनगर, काशिम- बाजार Bogra, Burnpur, Farakka, Haringhata, Jaykaynagar, & Kashimbazar				
	36,300	December, 1972	November, 1973	March, 1973 February, 1974
कुल्ती Kulti	10,000	December, 1972	Not anticipated	March, 1973 Not anticipated

परिशिष्ट II
APPENDIX—II

कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम
EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION

31 मार्च, 1974 तक योजना के अन्तर्गत आये तथा आने वाले कर्मचारियों तथा परिवार एककों की संख्या
Number of employees and family units covered and to be covered under the scheme upto 31st March, 1974

स्थान का नाम Name of Place	बीमाकृत कर्मचारी INSURED EMPLOYEES			परिवारों पर योजना के विस्तार की तारीख
	कार्यान्वयन की तारीख Date of implementation	योजना के अंतर्गत आई संख्या Number already covered	योजना के अंतर्गत आने वाली संख्या Number to be covered	Date of coverage of families
	1	2	3	4
आन्ध्र प्रदेश ANDHRA PRADESH				
हैदराबाद और सिकन्दराबाद Hyderabad and Secunderabad	1-5-1955	58,500		26-1-1959
नेलीमारला, चिट्टीवालासा, विजयवाड़ा, एलुरु, गुन्टूर, विशाखापटनम, पेद्दाकाकनी, टाडेपल्ली । Nellimarla, Chittivalasa, Vijaywada, Eluru, Guntur, Vishakhapatnam, Peddakakani & Tadepally	9-10-1955	25,200		26-1-1959
वारंगल Warangal	15-11-1959	7,000		14-2-1960
सिरपुर-कागज नगर Sirpur-Kaghaz Nagar	27-3-1960	10,000		26-6-1960

1	2	3	4	5
अदोनी व काकीनाडा Adoni and Kakinada	14-8-1960	6,600		13-11-1960
विजया नगरम और उसके उपांत Vizlanagram and its out-skirts	19-11-1961	3,000		18-2-1962
करनूल, डोलाईश्वरम, व राजामुन्दी Kurnool, Dowleswarm & Rajahmundry	25-3-1962	6,700		24-6-1962
रेनीगुन्टा Renigunta	29-4-1962	1,200		29-7-1962
गुन्टाकल और मार्कापुरम Guntakal and Markapuram	17-2-1963	2,500		19-5-1963
तनाकू व मासुलीपटनम Tanuku and Masulipatanam	23-2-1964	2,600		24-5-1964
चिन्नूर Chittoor	3-5-1964	700		2-8-1964
रामागुन्दम Ramagundam	2-5-1965	650		1-8-1965
नेल्लूर Nellore	17-10-1965	650		16-1-1966
कुड्डापहा Cuddapah	28-11-1965	900		27-2-1966
कालाहस्ती Kalahasti	19-12-1965	300		20-3-1966
कुप्पम Kuppam	26-12-1965	400		27-3-1966
चिराला Chirala	25-9-1966	600		25-12-1966
गुदुर Gudur	16-10-1966	800		15-1-1967
मचरेला Macherla	30-10-1966	600		29-1-1967
कोठावालासाह Kothavalsah	26-11-1967	400		25-2-1968
तिरुपति Tirupathi	17-3-1968	700		16-6-1968
विजयवाड़ा के उपांत Out-skirts of Vijaywada	7-11-1971	1,600		6-2-1972
नाट्टयापालेम Nattayyapalam	2-1-1972	1,200		2-4-1972
हिन्दुपुर Hindupur	1-10-1972	750		1-1-1973
पुदुगोपडु Pudugopadu	8-10-1972	500		8-1-1973
रामचन्द्रपुरम, श्रीराम नगर तथा कोठागुडम Ramachandrapuram, Sriram Nagar and Kothagudem	December, 1972		5,100	March, 1973
घाटेशर, गोपालपटनम, हैदराबाद (उपांत) मनचेरियल विजयगपुरी, विशाखापटनम Ghatesar, Gopalapatnam, Hyderabad (out-skirts) Mancheria, Vijayapuri & Vishakhapatnam	April, 1973		7,950	July, 1973
सेमेंट नगर तथा मेहबूब नगर Cement Nagar & Mehboob Nagar	June, 1973		1,050	September, 1973
असम ASSAM				
गोहाटी, तिनसुकिया और माकुम, धुरी और डिब्रुगढ़ Gauhati, Tinsukia and Makhum, Dhuri and Dibrugarh	28-9-1958	12,000		28-12-1953

1	2	3	4	5
जोरहाट Jorhat	1-9-1963	1,000		1-12-1963
चारद्वारा Charduar	9-2-1969	1,100		11-5-1969
मरियानी Mariani	16-3-1969	1,400		1-12-1969
पानोखाटी सहित चन्द्रपुर, चैरापूजी, डिगबोई, मार घोरिटा, नामरूप, शिलांग तथा सिलचर । Chandrapur includes Panikhati, Chetrapunji, Digboi, Marghorita, Namrup, Shillong & Silchar	May, 1973		8,200	August, 1973
तेजपुर Tezpur	June, 1973		750	September, 1973
बिहार BIHAR				
पटना, मुनेर, कटिहार और मगसलीपुर जालमियानगर, बनजारी और जपला Patna, Monghyr, Katihar & Samastipur	15-12-1957 27-3-1960	18,200 14,350		2-10-1958 26-6-1960
धनबाद और कुमार्धुबी Dhanbad and Kumardhubi	28-8-1960	13,950		27-11-1960
मुजफ्फरपुर, गया और मुकामेह Muzaffarpur, Gaya & Mokameh	31-3-1963	4,900		30-9-1963
भदानीनगर और मारहावड़ा Bhadaninagar and Marhowrah	30-6-1963	2,750		29-9-1963
भागलपुर Bhagalpur	26-12-1965	1,350		27-3-1966
रांची (छुटिया सहित) Ranchi inclusive Chutia	11-12-1966	5,500		12-3-1967
रामगढ़ कैंट Ramgarh Cantt.	28-11-1971	3,000		27-2-1972
आदित्यपुर Adityapur	1-10-1972	2,500		1-1-1973
दरभंगा, Darbhanga	December, 1972		700	March, 1973
पटना बनियादोह, दुमराव, झरिया, कन्द्रा तथा ओरा- मोक्षी (रांची केन्द्र) के निकटवर्ती क्षेत्र : Adjoining areas of Patna, Baniadih, Dumraon, Jharua, Kandra and Oramanjhi, (Centre Ranchi)	June, 1973		5,000	September, 1
बन्सजोरा, बरौली, परकाकाना, बोकारो, चन्द्रपुरा, छोट्टा- मुरी, धुरवा (रांची केन्द्र) दुग्दा, घाटशिला, गोमिया, हेलना शोकपान, कठारा, कटरासगढ़, खजारी मैथन, पठारदीह और सिन्दरी । Bansjora, Barauni, Barkakana, Bokaro Chandrapura, Chhotamuri, Dhurwa, (Centre Ranchi) Dugda, Gautsila, Gomla, Hesla, Jhink Pani, Kathara, Katrassgarh, Khalari, Maithon, Pathardih & Sindri	July, 1973		52,050	October, 1973
दिल्ली DELHI				
दिल्ली Delhi	24-2-1952	1,15,000		1-7-1959
गुजरात GUJARAT				
अहमदाबाद Ahmedabad	4-10-1964	2,35,000		3-1-1965

1	2	3	4	5
राजकोट व वकानेर Rajkot and Wankaner	28-11-1965	11,000		27-2-1966
कैम्बे Cambay	2-10-1966	5,000		31-12-1966
पेटलाद Petlad	27-11-1966	2,900		26-2-1967
भावनगर Bhavnagar	26-2-1967	10,000		28-5-1967
मोरवी Morvi	26-3-1967	4,000		25-6-1967
कलोल तथा पोरबन्दर Kalol and Porbunder	25-2-1968	20,200		26-5-1968
जामनगर व नडियाड Jam Nagar and Nadiad	31-3-1968	16,000		30-6-1968
धरगधरा Dharangadhra	29-12-1968	2,300		30-3-1969
बरौदा Baroda	16-3-1969	45,000		4-8-1969
सूरत नवगाव आदि सहित Surat includes Navgaon etc.	30-3-1969	27,000		4-8-1969
बरोच तथा सुरेन्द्र नगर Broach & Surendranagar	December, 1972		6,800	March, 1973
अहमदाबाद (उपनगर), आनन्द (बल्लभ विद्यानगर), अतुल (पुनोरा) बाजवा, बरेजोदी, भैलो, बिल्लि- मोरे, बलमर, चिखोडरा, देहगम, धूवारम, दोहाद द्वारका, हलोल, जूनागढ़, कोयाली, लिम्बदी, मेहसाना, मिथापुर, नवसारी, रतवाड़, रनोली, सेवालिया, सिद्धपुर, सिहोर, सिक्का, थानगढ़ नरोल सहित वाटवा वेरावल तथा विरामगम Ahmedabad (Suburbs), Anand (includes Vallabhvidya- nagar), Atul (Parnora) Bajwa, Barejadi, Bhali, Billimore, Bulsar, Chikhodra, Dehgam, Dhuvaran, Dohad, Dwarka, Halol, Junagadh, Koyali, Limbdi, Mohsana, Mithapur, Navsari Ranavar, Ranoli, Sovalia, Sidhpur, Sihor, Sikka, Thangadh, Vatva includes Narol, Veraval, and Viramgam.	August, 1973		77,600	November, 1973
हरियाणा HARYANA				
अम्बाला, भिवानी तथा यमुनानगर Ambala, Bhiwani & Yamuna Nagar	17-5-1953	21,400		1-11-1958
हिसार Hissar	8-1-1961	4,800		9-4-1961
सोनीपत Sonapat	19-2-1961	5,200		21-5-1961
फरीदाबाद Faridabad	14-1-1962	37,000		15-4-1962
पानीपत Panipat	16-9-1962	2,500		16-12-1962
मथुरा रोड (फरीदाबाद) पिनजोर, सुरजपुर तथा डालमिया दादरी Mathura Road (Faridabad), Pinjore, Surajpur and Dalmiadadi	21-2-1965	18,500		23-5-1965
बहादुरगढ़, बल्लभगढ़, गुरुगाव और रोहतक Bahadurgarh, Ballabhgarh, Gurgaon and Rohtak	27-2-1966	17,700		29-5-1966
रेवाड़ी तथा गानौर Rewari and Ganaur	25-2-1968	1,800		26-5-1968

1	2	3	4	5
मैसर्स जिन्दल स्ट्रिप्स का क्षेत्र Area of M/s. Jindal Strips	17-9-1972	200		17-12-1972
मिरसा, धुलेकोट तथा कर्नाल Sirsa, Dhulekote & Karnal	December, 1972		2,650	March, 1973
केरल KERALA				
अलेप्पी, एरनाकुलम, क्वालोनी, अलवेयी. त्रिचूर, अलगापानगर और उद्योगमंडल Alleppey, Ernakulam, Quilon, Alwaye, Trichur, Alagappanagar & Udyogamandal	16-9-1956	49,700		16-2-1963
त्रिवेन्द्रम Trivandrum	31-8-1958	5,600		1-2-1962
कोजीकोड और फेरोक Kozhikode and Feroke	12-7-1959	15,000		8-2-1965
मट्टांचेरी कोचीम व वेलिंगटन द्वीप सहित Mattancherry includes Cochin & Wellington Island.	3-1-1960 \ 26-1-1969 }	5,000		8-2-1964 \ 27-4-1969 }
कन्नानोर, बलीपट्टम तथा तेलीचेरी Cannanore, Baliapattam & Tellicherry	30-10-1960	8,900		30-3-1965
पुनालूर और कोटायम Punalur and Kottayam.	30-7-1961	7,500		30-11-1964 \ 30-7-1964 }
पेरुम्बवूर कोठा कुलमगारा (दक्षिण) सहित । Perumbavoor includes Kotha Kulangara (South)	17-12-1961	2,250		24-3-1966
अदिचनलूर Adichanallore	20-10-1963	2,500		20-2-1966
पालघाट कोडुम्बा सहित Palghat includes Kodumba	29-12-1963	3,500		9-11-1964
अदूर (सुरानद सहित) चथन्नूर, कुन्दारा कल्लुवथुकल, कोटाराकारा, पोयपल्ली, थ्रिकोविलवट्टम और वेट्टिकावाला । Adoor (includes Sooranad) Chathanoor, Kundara, Kalluvathukal, Kottarakara, Pooyapally, Thriko-vilvattam & Vettikkavala	1-3-1964	29,500		20-2-1966
चालाकुडी, कल्लेट्टुमकारा और कारुवनूर Chalakudy, Kallettumkara & Karuvannur.	17-1-1965	3,000		27-3-1966
शोराटो (कोठाकुलंगारा सहित) Koratty includes Kothakulangara.	25-4-1965	3,000		16-12-1967
शोरानूर और ऊटपल्लम Shoranur and Ottapalam	26-9-1965	2,300		26-12-1965
मवूर Mavoor.	21-8-1966	3,260		20-11-1966
नवीकुलम Navaikulam.	4-9-1966	600		4-12-1966
वेलियम और उमन्नूर Veliyam & Ummannur	25-6-1967	1,900		24-9-1967
पाल्लिकल, पाझायकुन्नुमेल तथा मदावूर Pallikkal, Pazhayakunnummel & Madavur.	10-12-1967	2,500		10-3-1968
बलरामपुरम, मय्नागपल्ली, कुलासेकरपुरम और थोडियूर Balaramapuram, Mynagappally, Kulasekharapuram and Thodiyoor.	24-3-1968	5,700		23-6-1968
नेदुमानगड Nedumangad.	26-1-1969	1,200		27-4-1969

1	2	3	4	5
माहे Mahe	16-8-1970	700		15-11-1970
एडमलकल Edammulakka	21-2-1971	800		23-5-1971
पुलुर Pullur	24-10-1971	2,000		23-1-1972
कायमकुलम Kayamkulam	30-10-1971	6,300		29-1-1972
मध्य प्रदेश MADHYA PRADESH				
इन्दौर, खालियार, उज्जैन तथा रतलाम Indore, Gwalior, Ujjain & Ratlam	23-1-1955	67,600		26-1-1959 15-2-1959
बरहानपुर Burhanpur	2-9-1956	4,200		15-2-1959
जबलपुर Jabalpur	29-9-1957	3,500		26-1-1959
भोपाल और नागदा Bhopal and Nagda	27-9-1959	12,500		27-12-1959
राजनंदगांव Rajnandgaon	25-9-1960	4,300		25-12-1960
मन्दासौर और देवास Mandsaur and Dewas	27-8-1961	3,800		26-11-1961
बनमोर Banmore	29-10-1961	650		28-1-1962
सतना Satna	3-12-1961	4,000		4-3-1962
रायगढ़ और रायपुर Raigarh and Raipur	28-1-1962	2,300		29-4-1962
कुम्हारो Kumhari	21-3-1971	1,400		20-6-1971
अमलाई Amlai	25-4-1971	2,550		25-7-1971
खंडवा और इटारसी Khandwa and Itarsi	16-5-1971	3,200		15-8-1971
निवार, नन्दिनी रोड (मिलाली केन्द्र) तथा गोविंदपुरा Niwar, Nandini Road (Centre Bhilai) & Govindpura	December, 1972		3,200	March, 1973
कोरबा और नेपानगर। Korba & Neplanagar	June, 1973		4,000	September, 1973
मिलाली, भोपाल-पिपलानी (भोपाल केन्द्र) कतनी Bhilal, Bhopal-Piplani (Centre Bhopal), Katni, Kymore, Lal Khadan & Sagar	August, 1973		47,000	November, 1973
महाराष्ट्र MAHARASHTRA				
बम्बई—बसीन सहित Bombay includes Bassein.	3-10-1954 12-11-1961	8,00,000		24-1-1962 11-2-1962
नागपुर Nagpur	11-7-1954	23,800		22-12-1960
अकोला और हिंगणघाट Akola and Hinganghat	27-5-1955	8,800		1-5-1961
शोलापुर Sholapur	17-11-1963	16,500		16-2-1964

1	2	3	4	5
पूना व इसके निकटवर्ती क्षेत्र Poona including its adjoining areas	15-8-1965	70,000		14-11-1965
नन्देद Nanded	20-3-1966	5,000		19-6-1966
कोल्हापुर Kolhapur	27-3-1966	7,300		26-6-1966
सांगली Sangli	30-4-1967	3,000		30-7-1967
औरंगाबाद Aurangabad	30-3-1969	1,800		12-9-1969
अमलनेर और पुलगाव Amalner and Pulgaon	29-8-1970	6,000		29-6-1970
जलगाव Jalgaon	18-10-1970	2,500		17-1-1971
नासिक Nasik	31-10-1971	3,500		30-1-1972
इचालकरांजी Ichalkaranji	30-1-1972	3,400		..
बल्लारपुर Ballarpur	27-2-1972	5,700		..
धुलिया Dhulia	26-3-1972	4,500		..
ओगलेवाडी, सतारा, चालीसगांव, तेलगांव, खोपोली, औद्योगिक क्षेत्र शोलापुर (शोलापुर के उपनगर), किरलोमकरवाडी अमरावती अचलपुर अहमदनगर, बालचन्दनगर पारस तथा भोर। Oglewadi, Satara, Chalisgaon, Talegaon, Khopoli, Industrial Estate-Sholapur (Sholapur Suburbs), Kirloskarwadi Amravati, Achalpur, Ahmednagar, Walchandnagar Paras & Bhor.,	June, 1973	27,650		September, 1973
भीरा, भीवपुरी, भूसावल, धनु रोड, लोनावाला माधवनगर, मालेगांव, मोरा-उरान, मूरगुड, पचोरा, रत्नगिरि, श्रीरामपुर, टिकेकारवाडी, (शोलापुर केन्द्र), उचगाव, वेनगुरला, चन्द्रापुर गोंडिया, कन्हन, खानगांव, लाटूर, एम० आई० डी० सी० तथा वार्धा। Bhira, Bhivpuri, Bhusawal, Dhanu Road, Lonawala, Madhavnagar, Malegaon, More-Uran, Murgud, Pachora, Ratnagiri, Shrirampur, Tikekarwadi (Centre Sholapur) Uchgaon, Vengurla, Chandrapur, Gondia, Kanhan, Khangaon, Latur, M.I.D.C. and Wardha	September, 1973	20,650		December, 1973
मैसूर MYSORE				
बंगलूर तथा इसके उपनगर Bangalore includes its suburbs	{ 27-7-1958 } { 24-11-1968 }	1,30,000		{ 26-10-1958 } { 23-2-1969 }
हबली Hubli	27-3-1960	6,800		26-6-1960
डंडेली Dandeli	8-1-1961	4,700		9-4-1961
मंगलूर Mangalore	21-1-1962	14,000		22-4-1962
मैसूर शहर Mysore City	4-3-1962	9,500		3-6-1962
बेलगांव Belgaon	31-3-1963	3,000		30-6-1963

1	2	3	4	5
गुलबर्ग Gulbarga	22-3-1964	3,000		21-6-1964
गोकाक Gokak	29-3-1964	8,000		28-6-1964
देवनगरे Davangere	3-10-1965	10,000		2-1-1966
कोलेगल और टी० नर्सीपुर Kollegal and T. Narsipur	18-3-1967	1,600		18-6-1967
नंगनगुड Nanjangud	28-1-1968	2,800		28-4-1968
हरिहर Harihar	24-3-1968	3,200		23-6-1968
हसन Hasan	20-9-1970	1,400		20-12-1970
व्हाइट फ़िल्ड तथा कुडुगुडी White Field and Kadugodi	26-9-1971	1,300		26-12-1971
के० जी० एफ० K.G.F.	26-12-1971	3,200		26-3-1972
धारवाड़ शाहबाद Dharwar Shahabad	16-1-1972	1,400		16-4-1972
होस्पेट तथा बेल्लारी Hospet & Bellary	26-3-1972	3,300		—
कनकपुरा Kanakapura	1-10-1972	600		1-1-1972
शाहबाद Shahbad	29-10-1972	3,200		29-1-1973
नारगुंड, बेलगोला, चन्नापटना, चित्रदुर्गा, गदग Nargund, Belagola, Channapatna, Chitradurga, Gadag & Bagalkot	December, 1972		5,450	March, 1973
भद्रावथी, कुंदापुर, जगफालस, शिमोगा और वडी Bhadraavathi, Coondapur, Jogfalls, Shimoga and Waddi	June, 1973		15,100	September, 1973
उड़ीसा : ORISSA				
कटक, बारंग, चौदवार, ब्रजराजनगर, राजगंजपुर ? Cuttack, Barang, Choudwar, Brajrajnagar & Rajganjpur	31-1-1960	25,300		1-5-1960
नारनगढ़ (तापंग) Narangarh (Tapang)	22-7-1962	250		21-10-1962
बारबिल Barbil	10-5-1964	1,000		9-8-1964
भुवनेश्वर Bhubneshwar	17-10-1965	550		16-1-1966
झारसुगुडा Jharsuguda	1-10-1967	2,900		31-12-1967
कंसाबहाल Kansabahal	24-3-1968	1,300		23-6-1968
जैकेपुर Jaykaypur	6-9-1970	2,500		6-12-1970
बेरहमपुर Berhampur	25-11-1972	1,250		25-2-1973
रूरकेला (हिन्दुस्तान स्टील के एककों के प्रतिरिक्त) Rourkela (excluding units of Hindustan Steel)	December, 1972		1,800	March, 1973
हीराकुंड, लटकटा तथा बेलपहार Hirakund, Latkata & Belpahar	June, 1973		4,800	September, 1973
जगन्नाथपुर, जोदा, संबलपुर, सुनाबेदा, तथा तलचेर Jagannathpur, Joda, Sambalpur Sunabeda & Talcher	October, 1973		5,050	January, 1974
पंजाब तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश PUNJAB & HIMACHAL PRADESH				
अमृतसर (वर्का सहित), छहर्टा, बटाला जलंधर Amritsar, (includes Verka), Chheharta, Batala, Jullundur and Ludhiana	17-5-1953	60,900		1-11-1958

1	2	3	4	5
खासा Khasa	10-5-1959	500		9-8-1959
धारीवाल Dhariwal	29-11-1959	3,500		28-2-1960
खरार Kharar	17-9-1961	2,000		17-12-1961
फगवाड़ा चाचक सहित, कपूरथला तथा गोबिन्दगढ़ । Phagwara including Chachaq, Kapurthala and Gobindgarh	28-1-1962	13,600		29-4-1962
पटियाला तथा राजपुरा Patiala and Rajpura	30-9-1962	8,200		30-12-1962
चण्डीगढ़ Chandigarh	7-10-1962	8,000		6-1-1963
अबोहर तथा बहादुरगढ़ Abohar and Bahadurgarh	21-2-1965	4,200		23-5-1965
गोराया, खन्ना, फिरोज़पुर तथा सिरहूँ Goraya, Khanna, Phillaur & Sirhind	27-2-1966	5,200		29-5-1966
नाभा, मलेरकोटला तथा मलौट मंडी Nabha, Malerkotla & Malout Mandi	16-6-1968	2,200		29-7-1969
नाहन, सोलन तथा सुन्दरनगर Nahan, Solan & Sundernagar	August, 1973		3,350	November, 1973
दीनानगर, जगतजीतनगर, मोगा, नंगल, संसारपुर तथा तलवारा Dinanagar, Jagatjitnagar, Moga, Nangal, Sansarpur and Talwara	October, 1973		7,500	January, 1974
राजस्थान : RAJASTHAN				
जयपुर, जोधपुर, बीकानेर, पालीमारवाड़, भीलवाड़ा तथा लाखेरी । Jaipur, Jodhpur, Bikaner, Palimarwar, Bhilwara & Lakheri.	2-12-1956	37,650		2-10-1958 9-3-1962
बियावार Beawar	27-10-1957	3,300		2-10-1958
सवाई माधोपुर Swai Madhopur	2-3-1958	2,750		2-10-1958
धोलपुर तथा श्रीगंगानगर Dholpur and Sriganganagar	29-3-1959	3,600		28-6-1959
उदयपुर तथा भरतपुर Udaipur and Bharatpur	14-8-1960	7,500		13-11-1960
अजमेर Ajmer	30-5-1965	1,450		29-8-1965
कोटा Kotah	15-8-1965	10,000		14-11-1965
किशनगढ़ Kishangarh	27-11-1966	2,300		26-2-1967
भवानी मंडी Bhawani Mandi	14-4-1968	1,650		14-7-1968
देवारी, अलवर तथा चित्तोरगढ़ (चधेरिया सहित) Dhebari, Alwar and Chittorgarh (includes Chaderia)	December, 1972		3,500	March, 1973
काबले नगर (अलनिया) तथा फलना Cable Nagar (Alnia) & Falna	October, 1973		1,300	January, 1974
तमिलनाडु TAMIL NADU				
कोयम्बटूर तथा उसके उपनगर, पी० एन० पलायम तथा पीलामेडु । Coimbatore and its suburbs, P.M. Palyam & Peelamedu	23-1-1955 28-2-1960	77,000		13-4-1969
मद्रास शहर तथा इसके उपनगर तथा रेड हिल्स Madras City, its suburbs & Red Hills	20-11-1955	1,50,000		27-11-1967
मदुराय तथा इसके उपनगर Madurai and its out-skirts	28-10-1956	30,000		3-6-1969

1	2	3	4	5
टूटीकोरिन तथा वी० एस० पुरम Tuticorin and V. S. Puram	28-10-1956	10,000		13-7-1970
सालेम, उदुमेलपेट तथा तीरुपुर तथा उसके उपनगर। Salem, Udumalpet and Tirupur and its out-skirts	30-11-1958	19,000		2-9-1961
मेट्टूर Mettur	30-11-1958	5,350		28-5-1967
सिवाकासी और राजापलायम Sivakasi and Rajapalayam	28-2-1960	16,100		15-8-1961
डालमियापुरम Dalmiapuram	27-3-1960	2,000		15-8-1961
त्रिची, रानीपेट तथा कावेरीनगर Trichy, Ranipet & Cauvery Nagar	29-1-1961	9,950		15-8-1961
दिन्दीगुल Dindigul	1-10-1961	2,500		31-12-1961
तिरुन्नलवेलि और उसके उपनगर तथा के० वाई० एम० दम्बस्डीज Tirunelveli and its out-skirts & K.Y.M. Industries	26-11-1961 \ 29-8-1971 f	7,000		25-2-1962
कुम्बाकोनम तथा परुमन्डी गाँव Kumbakonam & Perumandi Village	1-4-1962 \ 29-8-1972 f	2,500		1-7-1962
पुदुकोट्टाई तथा नामनासमुद्रम Pudukkottai and Namanasmudram	1-7-1962	1,100		30-9-1962
ईरोड तथा पोलाची Erode and Pollachi	30-12-1962	6,700		31-3-1963
वनियमबाडी कालन्दा Veniyaambadi includes Kalandra	24-2-1963	1,200		26-5-1963
गुदियाथम और विरुधनगर Gudiyatham and Virudhunagar	31-3-1963	3,650		30-6-1963
मेट्टूपलायम Mettuppalayam	30-6-1963	2,300		29-9-1963
शेनकोटाह तथा नगरकोइल Shencottah and Nagercoil	1-12-1963	1,850		1-3-1964
वेल्लोरे तथा नागापत्तनम Vellore and Nagapattanam	26-1-1964	2,550		26-4-1964
पांडीचेरी Pondicherry	2-10-1966	12,200		31-12-1966
कोविलपट्टी तथा उठुकुलि Kovilpatti and Uthukuli	31-3-1968	5,100		30-6-1968
अरनी Arni	26-1-1969	1,200		27-4-1969
वेडालुर तथा नीलकुपम Vedalur and Neehkupam	1-11-1970	2,600		31-1-1971
वीरा कालपुडूर Veera Kalpudur	30-5-1971	1,650		29-8-1971
पलानी तथा उसीलामपट्टी Pallani & Usilampatti	27-6-1971	2,200		26-9-1971
सोमानूर (अरासुर सहित) Somanur includes Arasur	30-1-1972	1,300		
करूर, अरुमुगनेरी, सालेम (उपनगर) तथा मेलूर Karur, Arumughaneri, Salem (suburbs) and Melur	June, 1973		4,300	September, 1973
अतूर, कुड्डल्लोरे, धारमपुरम, कन्याकुमारी (उप- नगर), नेवेली, पट्टीवेरानपट्टी, सन्कारी, सिवाकासी, (उपनगर राजापलायम के उपनगरों सहित) श्री- त्रिल्लिवपुर, धंजापूर थिरुवनसाङ्ग, थिरुमंगलम, थिरुवरामूर तथा वीराकाल्लूर। Attur, Cuddalore Dharampuram, Kanyakumari, (Suburbs), Neyveli, Pattiveeranapatti, Sankari, Sivakasi (suburbs includes suburbs of Rajapalayam), Srivilliputhur, Thanjavur, Thiruchengodu, Thirumangalam, Thiruvarambur and Viravanallur	October, 1973		20,600	January, 1974

1	2	3	4	5
उत्तर प्रदेश UTTAR PRADESH				
कानपुर तथा कल्याणपुर Kanpur and Kalyanpur	24-2-1952 31-3-1957 }	1,30,000		14-11-1959
आगरा, सहारनपुर तथा लखनऊ Agra, Saharanpur & Lucknow	15-1-1956	47,500		14-11-1959
इलाहाबाद, नैनी, वाराणसी तथा रामपुर Allahabad, Naini, Varanasi & Rampur	31-3-1957	33,400		14-11-1959
अलीगढ़, बरेली, इज्जतनगर, हाथरस, तथा शिकोहाबाद सहित Aligarh, Bareilly, including Izzatnagar, Hathras & Shikohabad	30-3-1958	25,000		14-11-1959
गाज़िबाबाद, मोदीनगर, सहजंनवा (गोरखपुर) तथा मिरजापुर। Ghaziabad, Modinagar, Sahjanwa (Gorakhpur, & Mirzapur	29-3-1959	46,600		14-11-1959
फिरोजाबाद, मेरठ तथा मुरादाबाद Ferozabad, Meerut & Muradabad	26-3-1961	12,900		25-6-1961
झांसी तथा रूड़की Jhansi and Roorkee	11-2-1962	2,100		13-5-1962
देहरादून, हापुड़, हरनगांव, तथा मथुरा Dohradun, Hapur, Harangaon and Mathura	31-3-1963	7,400		30-6-1963
चुरक, गाज़ीपुर तथा सीतापुर Churk, Ghazipur, and Sitapur	1-3-1964	5,500		31-5-1964
बालावाली, पीपरी, सासनी और उज्जानी Balawali, Pipri, Sasni and Ujhani	28-3-1965	9,100		27-8-1965
साहूपुरी Sahupuri	28-5-1967	1,100		27-8-1967
उन्नाव मगरवाड़ा सहित Unnao includes Magarwara	29-10-1967	3,300		28-1-1968
हरिद्वार, बम्बरोली, गोरखपुर तथा नैनी के उपनगर Hardwar, Bamrauli, Gorakhpur and Suburb of Naini 19-7-1970 29-11-1970 }		11,000 5,000		
हर्दुगंज, मुजफ्फर नगर, नजीबाबाद, मुखानपुर, एतमा- दपुर, नैनी के उपनगर तथा आगरा के परे का क्षेत्र। Harduaganj, Muzaffarnagar, Najibabad, Makhanpur, Etmadpur, suburb of Naini and area beyond Agra	December, 1972		20,000	March, 1973
रिशिकेश Rishikesh	June, 1973		4,500	September, 1973
अकबरपुर (टांडा सहित) बहजोई, फैजाबाद, (शोहा- बाल सहित), हलद्वानी, खमरिया, लोहाटी, (वाराणसी केन्द्र) तथा सरदार नगर। Akbarpur includes Tanda, Bahjoi, Faizabad includes Sohawal, Haldwani, Khamaria, Lohate (Centre Varanasi) and Sardar Nagar	November, 1973		4,600	February, 1974

पश्चिमी बंगाल
WEST BENGAL

कलकत्ता शहर तथा हावड़ा के पास के क्षेत्र।

Calcutta city and Howrah inclusive adjoining areas .	14-8-1955 5-6-1960	3,60,000	1,2,1963 1-7-1964
--	-----------------------	----------	----------------------

24-परमनामों के जिले।

District of 24-parganas	29-3-1964	3,15,000	1-7-1964
-----------------------------------	-----------	----------	----------

हुगली (जिला)

Hooghly (Distt).	30-10-1965	1,15,000	1-4-1966
--------------------------	------------	----------	----------

बाटानगर तथा दुर्गापुर

Batanagar and Durgapur	जून, 1973 June, 1973	52,600	September, 1973
----------------------------------	-------------------------	--------	-----------------

आसनसोल, भोगरा, बर्नपुर, फरक्का हरिषाटा, जंकेपुर,
काश्मिबाजार, कुल्टी रानीगंज, राणाघाट, रुप-
नारायणपुर, सीलीगुरी, सुन्दरचोक, टन्टेगरिया।

नवम्बर, 1973

Asansol, Bogra, Burnpur, Farakka, Haringhata, Jaykaynagar, Kashmi-bazar, Kulti, Raniganj, Ranaghat, Rupnarayanpur, Siliguri, Sunderchak and Tantegaria	November, 1973	65,500	February, 1974
---	----------------	--------	----------------

महायोग

GRAND TOTAL

39,84,500

4,90,000

EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION

वर्ष 1969-70 के आय तथा व्यय का व्यौरा

DETAILS OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEAR 1969-70

लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Accounts	मुख्यालय Headquarters	आन्ध्र प्रदेश Andhra Pradesh	असम Assam	बिहार Bihar	दिल्ली Delhi	गुजरात Gujarat	केरल Kerala	मध्य प्रदेश Madhya Pradesh
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
आय RECEIPTS								
नियोक्ताओं का विशेष अदान Employers' Special Contribution	—	51,45,105	9,39,265	51,47,433	57,77,640	2,12,14,818	64,33,792	58,36,264
कर्मचारियों का अदान Employees' Contribution	—	37,32,463	4,90,572	21,74,400	44,20,110	1,16,15,978	48,88,614	43,94,924
विविध Miscellaneous	40,78,091	28,64,495	4,517	2,20,180	34,018	1,26,585	11,58,601	25,27,408
कुल राजस्व आय Total Revenue Receipts	40,78,091	1,17,42,063	14,34,354	75,42,013	1,02,31,768	3,79,57,381	1,24,81,007	1,27,58,596
व्यय EXPENDITURE								
अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ A—Medical Benefit	—	1,07,96,084	3,00,000	27,03,644	61,14,482	1,77,71,065	51,12,114	64,25,929
ब—नकद लाभ B—CASH BENEFITS								
बीमारी हितलाभ Sickness Benefit	—	32,93,063	2,46,581	13,07,823	21,41,310	57,16,493	43,70,422	36,83,756
विस्तारित बीमारी हितलाभ Extended Sickness Benefit	—	1,63,689	16,727	1,37,509	3,47,162	6,98,264	4,46,401	4,27,919
मातृत्व हितलाभ Maternity Benefit	—	1,88,066	2,639	37,254	39,578	2,66,998	22,08,729	1,19,971
अस्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Temporary Disablement Benefit	—	3,25,598	48,131	1,43,604	4,45,262	16,90,113	4,55,886	6,82,893
स्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Permanent Disablement Benefit	—	3,33,000	1,17,000	2,62,000	9,40,000	24,88,000	5,47,000	2,28,000
आश्रितजन हितलाभ Dependents' Benefit	—	1,22,000	31,000	73,000	2,77,000	5,33,000	2,16,000	43,000
अन्त्येष्टि हितलाभ Funeral Benefit	—	30,283	1,465	13,500	13,700	86,501	37,000	36,677
कुल ब नकद लाभ Total B—Cash Benefits	—	44,55,699	4,63,543	19,74,690	12,04,012	1,14,79,369	82,81,438	52,22,216

लेख क नीचे Head of Accounts	महाराष्ट्र Maharashtra	मैसूर Mysore	उड़ीसा Orissa	पंजाब और हरियाणा Punjab & Haryana	राजस्थान Rajasthan	तमिलनाडु Tamil Nadu	उत्तर प्रदेश Uttar Pradesh	प० बंगाल West Bengal	योग TOTAL
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
आय RECEIPTS									
नियोक्ताओं का विशेष अंशदान Employers' Special Contribution	6,20,64,433	1,18,33,282	18,37,256	85,93,340	31,93,011	1,87,20,121	1,09,86,877	4,48,19,922	21,25,42,559
कर्मचारियों का अंशदान Employees' Contribution	4,50,99,270	80,49,645	8,58,735	61,94,719	23,68,363	1,38,07,975	78,35,067	3,11,17,569	15,20,48,404
विविध Miscellaneous	2,38,075	31,439	2,34,301	4,85,780	4,35,321	9,31,532	19,20,452	31,52,288	1,84,43,083
कुल राजस्व आय Total Revenue Receipts	10,74,01,778	1,99,14,366	29,30,292	1,52,73,839	59,96,695	3,34,59,628	2,07,42,396	7,90,89,779	38,30,34,046
व्यय EXPENDITURE									
अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ A—Medical Benefits	3,43,79,939	30,32,081	26,97,016	72,85,876	28,00,622	1,40,71,067	73,92,239	3,07,49,012	15,16,31,170
ब—नकद लाभ B—CASH BENEFITS									
बीमारी हितलाभ Sickness Benefit	4,04,37,292	45,52,000	8,02,441	14,12,560	9,64,284	1,22,79,230	50,50,469	2,99,68,157	11,62,25,881
विस्तारित बीमारी हितलाभ Extended Sickness Benefit	32,47,897	1,93,224	38,774	1,16,998	1,31,732	7,72,969	6,91,671	22,00,906	96,31,862
मातृत्व हितलाभ Maternity Benefit	14,64,403	5,75,496	26,154	52,183	81,056	6,35,348	18,261	3,86,513	61,02,649
अस्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Temporary Disablement Benefit	37,37,441	4,65,650	2,05,776	4,16,950	2,36,074	15,02,905	9,26,298	83,33,433	1,96,16,01
स्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Permanent Disablement Benefit	72,00,000	8,87,000	1,09,000	10,84,000	4,15,000	11,35,000	7,88,000	74,70,000	2,40,03,000
आश्रितजन हितलाभ Dependents' Benefit	16,16,000	3,44,000	20,000	2,54,000	1,82,000	2,53,000	3,23,000	6,92,000	49,79,000
अन्त्येष्टि हितलाभ Funeral Benefit	1,45,131	41,195	5,100	12,546	14,898	79,898	53,637	1,54,791	7,26,322
कुल ब—नकद लाभ Total B-Cash Benefits	5,78,48,164	70,58,585	12,07,245	33,49,237	20,25,044	1,66,58,350	78,51,336	4,92,05,800	18,12,84,728

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
स—अन्य हितलाभ C—Other Benefits	—	20,943	2,067	9,402	18,559	72,064	71,738	28,451
कुल हितलाभ Total Benefits	—	1,52,72,726	7,65,610	46,87,736	1,03,37,053	2,93,22,408	1,34,65,290	1,16,76,596
प्रशासन व्यय Administration Expenditure	85,53,999	10,87,446	1,47,665	6,43,814	10,01,711	24,57,071	14,38,585	8,75,018
चिकित्सालयों, व औषधालयों का मूल्यह्रास, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आदि। Depreciation, Repairs & Maintenance etc. of Hospitals & Dispensaries	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
राजस्व लेखा पर कुल व्यय Total Expenditure on Revenue Account.	1,44,18,101	1,63,60,172	9,13,275	53,31,550	1,13,38,764	3,17,79,569	1,49,03,875	8,67,21,789
आय RECEIPTS								
नियोक्ताओं का विशेष अंशदान Employers' Special Contribution	—	76,48,273	9,82,568	69,71,152	77,60,165	3,09,42,816	85,96,064	71,97,420
कर्मचारियों का अंशदान Employees' Contribution	—	43,58,002	4,70,357	23,12,658	44,04,504	1,71,94,941	47,43,051	43,51,672
विविध Miscellaneous	53,46,879	31,62,048	2,991	9,59,876	26,015	26,38,084	24,58,105	23,95,301
कुल राजस्व आय Total Revenue Receipts	53,46,879	1,51,62,323	14,55,916	1,02,43,686	1,21,90,684	5,07,75,841	1,57,97,220	1,39,44,393
व्यय EXPENDITURE								
अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ A—Medical Benefits	—	46,80,838	5,46,000	23,66,536	63,33,318	1,36,47,307	62,97,743	42,22,058
ब—नकद लाभ B—CASH BENEFITS :								
बीमारी हितलाभ Sickness Benefit	—	32,76,090	3,26,564	15,01,279	21,91,098	70,29,708	42,89,171	38,87,021
विस्तारित बीमारी हितलाभ Extended Sickness Benefit	—	2,04,663	26,012	1,73,790	4,91,328	5,80,649	4,22,748	4,38,413
मातृत्व हितलाभ Maternity Benefit	—	1,95,659	4,096	44,674	40,515	3,24,023	18,13,262	1,08,553
अस्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Temporary Disablement Benefit	—	3,73,896	70,487	1,85,020	4,73,591	19,77,702	5,29,811	7,60,768
स्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Permanent Disablement Benefit	—	2,58,000	1,69,000	1,73,000	10,39,000	24,63,000	5,78,000	4,47,000
वाञ्छितजन हितलाभ Dependents' Benefit	—	2,50,000	17,000	36,000	1,48,000	6,34,000	3,90,000	1,22,000
अन्त्येष्टि हितलाभ Funeral Benefit	—	30,495	2,990	15,898	14,224	95,415	34,700	36,000
कुल ब—नकद लाभ Total B- Cash Benefits	—	45,88,803	6,16,149	21,29,661	43,97,756	1,31,04,497	80,57,692	57,99,755

1	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
स—अन्य हितलाभ C—Other Benefits	2,64,891	45,281	5,921	17,845	15,070	61,532	20,439	2,22,891	8,77,094
कुल हितलाभ Total Benefits	9,24,92,994	1,01,35,947	39,10,182	1,06,52,958	48,40,736	3,07,90,949	1,52,64,014	8,01,77,703	33,37,92,992
प्रशासन व्यय Administration Expenditure	63,11,615	13,05,150	2,73,960	11,26,797	4,52,398	30,75,858	20,64,671	65,44,086	3,73,59,844
चिकित्सालयों व औषधालयों का मूल्यह्रास, संस्मृत व अनुरक्षण आदि Depreciation, Repairs & Maintenance etc. of Hospitals & Dispensaries	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	58,64,102
राजस्व लेखा पर कुल व्यय Total Expenditure on Revenue Account	9,88,04,609	1,14,41,097	41,84,142	1,17,79,755	52,93,134	3,38,66,807	1,73,28,685	8,67,21,789	37,70,16,938
नियोक्ताओं का विशेष अंशदान				आय RECEIPTS					
Employers, Special Contribution	8,68,48,603	1,71,61,189	27,30,746	1,16,20,967	46,84,252	2,77,61,068	1,49,15,223	5,96,92,475	29,55,06,981
कर्मचारियों का अंशदान Employees, Contribution.	4,95,65,369	84,50,936	10,58,512	73,07,934	27,67,352	1,54,72,674	90,72,957	3,34,35,900	16,49,66,819
विविध Miscellaneous	1,93,228	16,29,035	2,40,365	15,30,103	3,28,151	67,12,801	18,94,603	59,97,463	3,55,15,048
कुल राजस्व आय Total Revenue Receipts.	13,66,07,200	2,72,41,160	40,29,623	2,04,59,004	77,79,755	4,99,46,543	2,58,82,783	9,91,25,838	49,59,88,848
				व्यय EXPENDITURE					
अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ A—Medical Benefits.	3,63,43,357	89,67,296	10,79,575	71,58,498	27,05,410	1,21,47,073	71,22,620	3,12,52,947	14,48,70,576
ब—नकद लाभ B—CASH BENEFITS :									
बीमारी हितलाभ Sickness Benefit	4,14,23,238	56,22,124	7,18,956	15,35,938	10,05,833	1,36,23,360	50,59,039	4,56,11,535	13,71,00,949
विस्तारित बीमारी हितलाभ Extended Sickness Benefits	34,21,193	2,43,718	36,953	1,38,812	1,27,039	8,35,113	7,61,857	21,84,527	1,00,86,820
मातृत्व हितलाभ Maternity Benefit	14,65,258	6,56,104	35,462	62,922	84,145	6,66,591	27,737	4,94,020	60,23,031
अस्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Temporary Disablement Benefit	40,73,922	5,20,862	2,53,659	5,06,434	2,53,570	17,30,496	9,87,712	1,62,52,136	2,89,50,066
स्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Permanent Disablement Benefit	1,18,08,000	8,60,000	2,45,000	11,94,000	4,50,000	22,73,000	9,83,000	87,45,000	3,16,94,000
आश्रितजन हितलाभ Dependents Benefits.	22,31,000	2,89,000	92,000	3,99,000	1,31,000	5,33,000	3,86,000	10,01,000	66,59,000
अन्त्येष्टि हितलाभ Funeral Benefit.	1,56,703	43,253	7,096	16,165	18,362	84,800	49,693	1,78,843	7,84,637
कुल ब—नकद लाभ Total B—Cash Benefits	6,45,79,314	82,35,061	13,89,126	38,53,271	20,78,949	1,97,46,360	82,55,038	7,45,07,071	22,13,38,503

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
स-अन्य हितलाभ C-Other Benefits	—	12,486	2,860	6,132	17,052	49,139	45,286	11,402
कुल हितलाभ Total Benefits	—	92,82,127	11,65,009	45,02,329	1,07,48,126	2,68,00,943	1,44,00,721	1,00,33,215
प्रशासन व्यय Administration Expenses	52,14,702	13,03,973	1,61,797	6,96,010	9,09,255	25,03,706	16,04,810	9,16,348
चिकित्सालयों, अस्पतालों का मूल्यह्रास, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आदि Depreciation Repairs & Maintenance etc. of Hospitals & Dispensaries.	63,56,666	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
पूँजीगत निर्माण/आरक्षित निधि Capital Construction/Reserve Fund	3,69,64,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
राजस्व लेखा पर कुल व्यय Total Expenditure on Revenue A/c	4,85,35,368	1,05,86,100	13,26,806	51,98,339	1,16,57,381	2,93,04,649	1,60,05,531	1,09,49,563

लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Account	मुख्यालय Head quarters	आन्ध्र प्रदेश Andra Pradesh	असम Assam	बिहार Bihar	दिल्ली Delhi	गुजरात Gujarat	हरियाणा Haryana	केरल Kerala	मध्य प्रदेश Madhya Pradesh
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.

आय
RECEIPTS

नियोक्ताओं का विशेष अंशदान Employers' Special Contribution		90,62,495	12,80,465	79,73,618	88,80,175	3,22,53,245	77,59,053	95,41,680	73,12,552
कर्मचारियों का अंशदान Employees' Contribution	47,93,917	5,16,337	23,89,087	44,78,155	1,74,29,927	40,43,808	49,00,802	44,03,720
विविध Miscellaneous	54,27,937	14,70,996	11,325	3,32,058	31,187	19,89,361	9,01,188	11,70,091	11,33,229
कुल राजस्व आय Total Revenue Receipts	54,27,937	1,53,27,408	18,08,127	1,06,94,763	1,33,89,517	5,16,72,533	1,27,04,049	1,56,12,573	1,28,49,501

व्यय
EXPENDITURE

अ-चिकित्सा हितलाभ A-Medical Benefits	59,40,000	5,68,000	26,73,000	81,99,589	1,67,68,000	44,05,000	69,60,000	50,42,000
ब-नकद लाभ B-Cash Benefits									
बीमारी हितलाभ Sickness Benefit.	36,11,042	3,86,675	17,91,425	19,74,747	72,11,619	11,26,502	46,52,375	47,50,218
विस्तारित बीमारी हितलाभ Extended Sickness Benefit.	2,19,239	37,550	1,77,837	4,66,669	6,73,524	99,213	3,89,777	4,47,651
मातृत्व हितलाभ Maternity Benefit.	2,57,794	4,361	53,754	50,484	3,12,037	64,915	16,89,529	1,03,654
अस्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Temporary Disablement Benefit.	4,47,518	54,622	1,89,568	4,80,941	20,87,857	3,23,816	5,51,886	10,70,814
स्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Permanent Disablement Benefit.	(—)	74,52,865	10,36,000	1,86,000	1,74,000	17,43,000	37,66,000	7,57,000	8,42,000
आश्रितजन हितलाभ Dependents, Benefit.	(—)	24,70,494	56,000	19,000	10,000	1,65,000	12,10,000	2,73,000	32,000

स-अन्य हित लाभ C-Other Benefits	1,81,606	42,773	6,013	17,112	8,159	52,778	15,365	2,11,638	6,79,801
कुल हितलाभ Total Benefits	10,11,04,277	1,72,45,130	24,74,714	1,10,28,881	47,92,518	3,19,46,211	1,53,93,023	10,59,71,656	36,68,88,880
प्रशासन व्यय Administration Expenses	71,35,422	14,17,772	3,22,238	13,13,454	4,98,449	35,76,616	23,91,148	72,25,589	3,71,91,289
चिकित्सालयों, औषधालयों का मूल्यह्रास, मरम्मत व अन्तरिक्ष आदि Depreciation, Repairs & Maintenance etc of Hospitals & Dispensaries	63,56,666
पूजायुक्त चिकित्सा (संचित) दायित्व Capital/Medicals (Accumulated) Liabilities	3,69,64,000
राजस्व लेखा पर कुल व्यय Total Expenditure on Revenue Account	10,82,39,699	1,86,62,902	27,96,952	1,23,42,335	52,90,967	3,55,22,827	1,77,84,171	11,31,97,245	44,74,00,835

लेखा के शीर्ष Head of Account	महाराष्ट्र Maharashtra	मैसूर Mysore	उड़ीसा Orissa	पंजाब व हरियाणा Punjab & Haryana	राजस्थान Rajasthan	तमिलनाडु Tamil Nadu	उत्तर प्रदेश Uttar Pradesh	प० बंगाल West Bengal	योग Total
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
आय RECEIPTS									
नियोक्ताओं का विशेष अंशदान Employers' Special Contribution	9,67,20,783	2,05,95,541	30,43,316	64,13,709	52,46,430	3,06,89,016	1,73,86,961	6,93,21,591	33,34,80,680
कर्मचारियों का अंशदान Employees' Contribution	5,17,16,847	96,48,580	11,54,391	35,43,073	29,05,456	1,61,36,569	95,87,505	3,93,57,018	17,70,05,192
विविध Miscellaneous	3,66,083	4,71,972	75,228	5,13,704	2,87,127	23,62,253	8,95,780	79,36,355	2,53,75,874
कुल राजस्व आय Total Revenue Receipts	14,88,03,713	3,07,16,093	42,72,935	1,04,70,486	84,39,013	4,91,87,838	2,78,70,246	11,66,14,964	53,58,61,696
व्यय EXPENDITURE									
अ-चिकित्सा हितलाभ A-Medicals Benefits	3,91,82,222	98,40,000	12,14,000	41,33,000	30,34,000	1,87,44,000	79,40,000	3,56,74,000	17,03,16,811
ब-नकद लाभ B-Cash Benefits									
बीमारी हितलाभ Sickness Benefit	3,61,79,045	63,51,797	7,40,743	6,21,452	11,82,730	1,74,14,891	54,91,109	4,34,77,744	13,69,64,114
विस्तारित बीमारी हितलाभ Extended Sickness Benefit	35,54,381	2,77,285	30,965	48,601	1,33,781	9,67,493	5,89,218	23,11,498	1,04,54,682
मातृत्व हितलाभ Maternity Benefit	15,87,789	7,37,032	43,786	26,102	97,582	7,61,690	34,824	6,29,166	64,54,459
अस्थायी अप्रगता हितलाभ Temporary Disablement Benefit	38,48,798	6,33,485	1,86,976	2,23,998	2,93,996	18,43,368	13,46,533	1,67,22,443	3,02,26,619
स्थायी अप्रगता हितलाभ Permanent Disablement Benefit	1,00,54,000	8,76,000	2,12,000	12,30,000	4,62,000	17,76,000	11,54,000	39,56,000	2,14,37,135
आश्रितजन हितलाभ Dependants, Benefit	24,68,000	3,36,000	85,000	2,85,000	35,000	3,01,000	4,35,000	5,61,000	41,98,506

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
अन्त्येष्टि हितलाभ Funeral Benefit.	..	33,392	2,100	16,100	12,998	81,273	9,700	34,100	38,388
कुल ब—नकद लाभ Total B—Cash Benefits.	(—)99,23,359	56,60,985	6,90,308	24,12,684	49,23,839	1,52,62,310	26,54,146	83,91,667	72,74,725
स—अन्य हितलाभ C—Other Benefits.	..	18,898	4,383	5,637	23,663	54,327	8,443	46,032	11,876
कुल हितलाभ Total Benefits.	(—)99,23,359	1,16,19,883	12,62,691	50,91,321	1,31,47,091	3,20,84,637	70,67,589	1,53,97,699	1,23,28,601
प्रशासन व्यय Administration Expenditure.	1,08,34,831	15,55,431	1,86,394	7,76,782	11,39,488	28,43,433	6,79,394	18,47,331	10,71,446
चिकित्सालयों तथा औषधालयों का मूल्यहास मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण Depreciation Repairs & Maintenance etc. of Hospitals & Dispensaries.	63,54,835
पूजीगत निर्माण/आरक्षित निधि Capital Construction/Revenue Fund	4,04,35,000
राजस्व लेखा पर कुल व्यय Total Expenditure on Revenue Account.	4,77,01,307	1,31,75,314	14,49,085	58,68,103	11,42,86,579	3,49,28,070	77,46,983	1,72,45,030	1,34,00,567
आय RECEIPTS									
नियोक्ताओं का विशेष अंशदान Employers, Special Contribution	..	1,00,00,000	13,50,000	1,03,00,000	96,00,000	3,73,00,000	94,00,000	1,05,67,000	1,00,00,000
कर्मचारियों का अंशदान Employees, Contribution	..	55,00,000	5,50,000	26,12,000	49,70,000	1,92,48,000	47,00,000	54,00,000	57,00,000
विविध Miscellaneous	1,31,48,000	21,45,000	5,000	4,84,000	18,16,000	16,82,000	7,71,000	17,54,000	13,80,000
कुल राजस्व आय Total Revenue Receipts	1,31,48,000	1,76,45,000	19,05,000	1,30,96,000	1,63,86,000	5,82,30,000	1,48,71,000	1,77,21,000	1,70,80,000

1	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
अन्त्येष्टि हितलाभ Funeral Benefit	1,58,304	40,500	7,500	9,268	15,800	88,296	59,658	1,93,605	8,00,982
कुल-द-नकद लाभ Total B—Cash Benefit	5,78,50,317	92,52,099	13,06,970	24,44,421	22,20,889	2,31,52,738	91,10,342	6,78,51,456	21,05,36,537
म—अन्य हितलाभ C—Other Benefits	1,75,803	46,389	6,120	11,183	9,218	61,675	20,770	2,53,631	7,58,058
कुल हितलाभ Total Benefits	9,72,08,342	1,91,38,498	25,27,090	65,88,604	52,64,107	4,19,58,413	1,70,71,112	10,37,79,087	38,16,11,406
प्रशासन व्यय Administration Expenses	80,07,843	17,04,217	4,55,180	7,85,902	6,80,178	38,03,391	26,66,851	87,00,444	4,77,39,056
चिकित्सालयों, औषधालयों का मूल्यह्रास, मरम्मत नया अनुरक्षण आदि । Depreciation, Repairs & Maintenance etc. of Hospitals & Dispensaries.	63,54,835
पुंजीगत निर्माण/चिकित्सा (संचित) दायित्व Capital Construction/Medical (Accumulated) Liabilities.	4,04,35,000
राजस्व लेखा पर कुल व्यय Total Expenditure on Revenue Account	10,52,16,185	2,08,42,715	29,82,270	73,74,506	50,44,285	4,57,61,804	1,97,37,963	11,24,79,531	47,61,40,297
अन्य RECEIPTS									
नियोक्ताओं का विशेष अक्षदान Employers' Special Contribution	10,69,50,000	2,35,00,000	32,64,000	72,30,000	66,33,000	3,20,00,000	2,04,00,000	8,03,00,000	37,84,94,000
कर्मचारियों का अक्षदान Employees' Contribution	5,37,00,000	1,12,00,000	11,35,000	40,00,000	34,50,000	1,39,00,000	1,04,00,000	3,80,00,000	18,44,65,000
विविध Miscellaneous	4,97,000	6,07,000	2,07,000	5,77,000	4,25,000	91,38,000	14,56,000	74,81,000	4,35,73,000
कुल राजस्व आय Total Revenue Receipts	16,11,47,000	3,53,07,000	46,06,000	1,18,07,000	1,05,08,000	5,50,38,000	3,22,56,000	12,57,81,000	60,65,32,000

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
व्यय EXPENDITURE									
अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ A—Medical Benefits	84,97,000	7,66,000	36,43,000	88,63,000	1,99,42,000	58,07,000	89,68,000	60,71,000
ब—नकद लाभ B—CASH BENEFITS.									
बीमारी हितलाभ { Sickness Benefit,	38,00,000	4,35,000	18,50,000	21,00,000	67,00,000	12,82,000	50,25,000	48,55,000
विस्तारित बीमारी हितलाभ Extended Sickness Benefit,	2,87,000	40,000	2,30,000	4,78,000	7,00,000	1,14,000	3,87,000	5,40,000
मातृत्व हितलाभ Maternity Benefit	3,25,000	5,000	44,000	48,000	3,00,000	75,000	21,43,000	1,08,000
अस्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Temporary Disablement Benefit	4,85,000	65,000	2,40,000	6,37,000	20,40,000	3,67,000	6,82,000	13,25,000
स्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Parmanent Disablement Benefit	8,66,000	1,88,000	2,98,000	20,32,000	39,58,000	7,26,000	8,78,000	6,00,000
आश्रित जन हितलाभ Dependent's Benefit	71,000	11,000	1,14,000	1,58,000	13,37,000	2,74,000	3,19,000	2,58,000
अन्त्येष्टि हितलाभ Funeral Benefit	33,000	4,000	20,000	17,000	90,000	12,000	30,000	44,000
कुल नकद हितलाभ Total B—Cash Benefits	58,67,000	7,48,000	27,96,000	54,70,000	1,51,25,000	28,50,000	94,64,000	77,30,000
स—अन्य हितलाभ C—Other Benefits	5,00,000	22,000	4,000	6,000	24,000	53,000	9,000	50,000	16,000
कुल हितलाभ Total Benefits	5,00,000	1,43,86,000	15,18,000	64,45,000	1,43,57,000	3,51,20,000	86,66,000	1,84,82,000	1,38,17,000
प्रशासन व्यय Administration Expenses	49,90,000	18,68,000	2,45,000	9,40,000	13,70,000	31,18,000	8,50,000	22,20,000	13,15,000
चिकित्सालयों तथा औषधालयों का मूल्यहास मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण Depreciation, Repairs & Maintenance etc. of Hospitals & Dispensaries	89,94,000
पूंजीगत निर्माण/आरक्षित निधि Capital Construction/Reserve Fund	4,60,00,000
राजस्व लेख पर कुल व्यय Total Expenditure on Revenue Account	6,04,84,000	1,62,54,000	17,63,000	73,85,000	1,57,27,000	3,82,38,000	95,16,000	2,07,02,000	1,51,32,000

1	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
व्यय EXPENDITURE									
अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ A—Medical Benefits . . .	4,85,05,000	1,23,67,600	17,23,000	56,36,000	33,17,000	2,18,33,000	1,62,70,000	4,15,29,000	21,37,37,000
ब—नकद लाभ B—CASH BENEFITS									
बीमारी हितलाभ Sickness Benefit . . .	1,70,00,000	75,50,000	10,00,000	7,35,000	12,00,000	1,96,00,000	61,00,000	1,87,00,000	9,79,32,000
विस्तारित बीमारी हितलाभ Extended Sickness Benefit . . .	33,20,000	3,20,000	36,000	60,000	1,54,000	9,50,000	5,85,000	25,00,000	1,07,01,000
मातृत्व हितलाभ Maternity Benefit . . .	16,70,000	8,70,000	42,000	26,000	1,10,000	7,50,000	37,000	5,46,000	70,99,000
अस्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Temporary Disablement Benefit . . .	35,00,000	8,64,000	1,72,000	2,55,000	3,83,000	17,65,000	12,16,000	68,86,000	2,08,82,000
स्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Permanent Disablement Benefit . . .	1,04,12,000	12,84,000	1,93,000	11,48,000	5,80,000	15,29,000	11,20,000	36,74,000	2,94,86,000
आश्रितजन हितलाभ Dependents' Benefit . . .	20,48,000	3,19,000	1,53,000	3,57,000	2,50,000	3,42,000	4,21,000	7,89,000	72,21,000
अन्त्येष्टि हितलाभ Funeral Benefit . . .	1,55,000	45,000	10,000	10,000	16,000	92,000	68,000	2,03,000	8,49,000
कुल ब—नकद लाभ Total B—Cash Benefits . . .	3,81,05,000	1,12,52,000	16,06,000	25,91,000	26,93,000	2,50,28,000	95,47,000	3,32,98,000	17,41,70,000
स—अन्य हितलाभ C—Other Benefits . . .	1,80,000	55,000	6,000	11,000	9,000	65,000	23,000	1,89,000	12,22,000
कुल हितलाभ Total Benefits . . .	8,67,90,000	2,36,74,000	33,35,000	82,38,000	60,19,000	4,69,26,000	2,58,40,000	7,50,16,000	38,91,29,000
प्रशासन व्यय Administration Expenses . . .	94,60,000	22,80,000	6,22,000	8,60,000	8,00,000	49,20,000	28,25,000	1,01,20,000	4,88,03,000
चिकित्सालयों तथा औषधालयों का मूल्यहास, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आदि Depreciation, Repairs & Maintenance etc. of Hospitals & Dispensaries . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	89,94,000
पूंजीगत निर्माण/आरक्षित निधि Capital Construction/Reserve fund . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4,60,00,000
राजस्व लेखा पर कुल व्यय Total Expenditure on Revenue Account . . .	9,62,50,000	2,59,54,000	39,57,000	90,98,000	68,19,000	5,18,46,000	2,86,65,000	8,51,36,000	49,29,26,000

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
आय RECEIPTS									
नियोक्ताओं का विशेष अज्ञदान Employers' Special Contribution	—	1,10,00,000	20,25,000	1,05,00,000	99,00,000	4,28,00,000	96,00,000	1,09,00,000	1,34,00,000
कर्मचारियों का अज्ञदान Employees' Contribution	—	60,00,000	8,30,000	30,00,000	51,75,000	2,23,00,000	48,00,000	55,70,000	75,45,000
विविध Miscellaneous	1,40,66,000	21,50,000	5,000	4,85,000	18,17,000	16,87,000	7,75,000	17,55,000	15,65,000
कुल राजस्व आय Total Revenue Receipts	1,40,66,000	1,91,50,000	28,60,000	1,39,85,000	1,68,92,000	6,67,87,000	1,51,75,000	1,82,25,000	2,25,10,000
व्यय EXPENDITURE									
अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ A—Medical Benefits	—	96,29,000	20,64,000	48,94,000	97,95,000	2,18,24,000	68,70,000	1,37,55,000	74,19,000
ब—नकद लाभ B—CASH BENEFITS									
बीमारी हितलाभ Sickness Benefit	—	42,30,000	5,30,000	20,00,000	23,00,000	76,00,000	13,25,000	54,00,000	51,65,000
विस्तारित बीमारी हितलाभ Extended Sickness Benefit	—	3,10,000	50,000	2,50,000	5,18,000	7,50,000	1,25,000	4,10,000	5,65,000
मातृत्व हितलाभ Maternity Benefit	—	3,55,000	6,000	50,000	52,000	3,25,000	80,000	23,00,000	1,15,000
अस्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Temporary Disablement Benefit	—	5,50,000	1,00,000	4,10,000	6,50,000	23,60,000	3,80,000	7,04,000	17,80,000
स्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Permanent Disablement Benefit	—	13,19,000	3,23,000	3,39,000	20,32,000	47,42,000	8,62,000	9,67,000	9,65,000
आश्रितजन हितलाभ Dependents' Benefit	—	71,000	33,000	1,14,000	1,83,000	15,24,000	3,11,000	3,19,000	2,86,000
अन्त्येष्टि हितलाभ Funeral Benefit		38,000	6,000	33,000	20,000	90,000	13,000	36,000	55,000
कुल ब—नकद लाभ Total B—Cash Benefits	—	68,73,000	10,48,000	31,96,000	57,55,000	1,74,11,000	30,96,000	1,01,36,000	89,31,000
ग—अन्य हितलाभ C—Other Benefits	—	23,000	6,000	8,000	26,000	61,000	12,000	55,000	18,000
कुल हितलाभ Total Benefits	—	1,65,25,000	31,18,000	80,98,000	1,55,76,000	3,92,76,000	96,78,000	2,39,46,000	1,63,68,000

10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
रुपय RECEIPTS									
नियोक्ताओं का विशेष अंशदान Employers' Special Contribution	11,10,89,000	2,56,00,000	35,00,000	76,60,000	67,09,000	3,32,00,000	2,16,00,000	8,31,00,000	40,25,74,000
कर्मचारियों का अंशदान Employees' Contribution	5,60,50,000	1,15,32,000	12,00,000	42,30,000	35,70,000	1,48,50,000	1,10,00,000	4,15,00,000	19,91,52,000
विविध Miscellaneous	5,20,000	6,06,000	2,07,000	5,80,000	4,25,000	1,03,81,000	14,67,000	59,88,000	4,44,79,000
कुल राजस्व आय Total Revenue Receipts	16,76,59,000	3,77,38,000	49,07,000	1,24,70,000	1,06,95,000	5,84,31,000	3,40,67,000	13,05,88,000	64,62,05,000
व्यय EXPENDITURE									
अ—चिकित्सा हितलाभ A—Medical Benefits	5,19,69,000	1,41,24,000	22,47,000	66,99,000	46,23,000	2,40,30,000	2,09,26,000	4,82,44,000	24,91,12,000
ब—नकद लाभ B—CASH BENEFITS :									
बीमारी हितलाभ Sickness Benefit	1,93,60,000	82,10,000	11,00,000	7,69,000	13,00,000	2,00,00,000	64,00,000	2,00,00,000	10,56,80,000
विस्तारित बीमारी हितलाभ Extended Sickness Benefit	35,00,000	3,46,000	40,000	65,000	1,60,000	9,85,000	6,36,000	25,55,000	1,12,65,000
मातृत्व हितलाभ Maternity Benefit	17,45,000	9,30,000	50,000	30,000	1,20,000	8,09,000	42,000	6,40,000	76,40,000
अस्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Temporary Disablement Benefit	37,04,000	9,46,000	2,20,000	2,80,000	4,02,000	18,40,000	13,25,000	86,50,000	2,43,01,000
स्थायी अपंगता हितलाभ Permanent Disablement Benefit	1,16,95,000	12,84,000	3,03,000	14,06,000	5,80,000	20,05,000	13,95,000	46,53,000	3,48,70,000
आश्रितजन हितलाभ Dependents' Benefit	28,75,000	4,21,000	1,53,000	3,75,000	2,50,000	3,50,000	5,27,000	7,89,000	85,81,000
अन्त्येष्टि हितलाभ Funeral Benefit	1,50,000	51,000	13,000	12,000	20,000	80,000	75,000	2,00,000	8,92,000
कुल—ब—नकद लाभ Total B—Cash Benefits	4,30,29,000	1,21,88,000	18,79,000	29,28,000	28,32,000	2,60,60,000	1,04,00,000	3,74,87,000	19,32,29,000
ग—अन्य हितलाभ C—Other Benefits	2,05,000	64,000	9,000	13,000	10,000	75,000	24,000	2,14,000	8,23,000
कुल हितलाभ Total Benefits	9,52,03,000	2,63,76,000	41,35,000	96,40,000	74,65,000	5,01,65,000	3,13,50,000	8,59,45,000	44,31,64,000

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
प्रशासन व्यय Administration Expenses	47,50,000	18,85,000	2,58,000	9,87,000	14,42,000	30,12,000	9,45,000	21,94,000	13,15,000
चिकित्सालयों, औषधालयों का मूल्यह्रास, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आदि Depreciation, Repairs & Maintenance etc. of Hospitals and Dispensaries	95,00,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
पूंजीगत निर्माण/आरक्षित निधि Capital Construction/Reserve Fund	5,00,00,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
राजस्व लेखा पर कुल व्यय Total Expenditure on Revenue Account	6,42,50,000	1,84,10,000	33,76,000	90,85,000	1,70,18,000	4,22,88,000	1,09,23,000	2,61,40,000	1,76,83,000

1	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
प्रशासन व्यय Administration Expenses	96,00,000	24,62,000	5,82,000	9,56,000	8,10,000	50,93,000	29,30,000	1,12,80,000	5,05,01,000
चिकित्सालयों तथा औषधालयों का मूल्यह्रास, मरम्मत व अनुरक्षण आदि Depreciation Repairs & Maintenance etc. of Hospitals and Dispensaries	95,00,000
पूंजीगत निर्माण/चिकित्सा (संचित) दायित्व Capital Construction Reserve Fund	5,00,00,000
राजस्व लेखा पर कुल व्यय Total Expenditure on Revenue Account	10,48,03,000	2,88,38,000	47,17,000	1,05,96,000	82,75,000	5,52,58,000	3,42,80,000	9,72,25,000	55,31,65,000

NOTE :—Ad-hoc increase of:—

- Rs. 100 lacs in Employers' Special Contribution and Total Revenue Receipts.
- Rs. 292.50 lacs (90% of Rs. 3.25 crores) in Medical Benefits.
- Rs. 50 lacs in Administration Expenses.
- Rs. 342.50 lacs (b+c) in total Expenditure on Revenue Account.

कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम
EMPLOYEES' STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION

वर्ष 1973-74 के लिये बजट प्राक्कलन

BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE YEAR 1973-74

"भत्ते तथा मानदेय" शीर्ष के अन्तर्गत उपबन्धित राशि का विवरण

DETAILS OF THE AMOUNTS PROVIDED UNDER THE HEAD "ALLOWANCES & HONORARIA"

परिशिष्ट—8

APPENDIX VIII

स्थापना का वर्ग	यात्रा भत्ता	महंगाई वेतन सहित महंगाई भत्ता	अंतरिम सहायता	मकान किराया भत्ता	नगर प्रतिकर भत्ता	प्रेक्टिस बन्दी भत्ता	चिकित्सा व्यय की क्षतिपूर्ति	अन्य मद	योग
Category of Establishment	Travelling Allowance	Dearness Allowance inclusive Dearness Pay	Interim Relief	House Rent Allowance	City Compensatory Allowance	Non Practising Allowance	Re-imbursement of Medical Charges	Other Items	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
अ—अधीक्षण A—SUPERINTENDENCE									
प्रधान अधिकारी Principal Officer	28,600	3,600	..	20,400	4,500	7,200	..	700	65,000
अन्य अधिकारी Other Officers	1,86,000	2,70,000	4,30,000	2,39,000	1,20,000	1,54,000	55,000	1,07,000	15,61,000
लिपिक वर्गीय स्थापना Ministerial Establishment	3,89,000	38,79,000	34,94,000	16,99,500	5,70,500	..	6,02,000	2,83,000	109,17,000
चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी Class IV Servants	43,000	6,64,000	6,55,000	2,51,000	93,000	..	1,52,000	77,000	19,35,000
ब—क्षेत्रीय कार्य B—FIELD WORK									
अधिकारी Officers	22,000	1,55,000	1,49,000	79,000	29,000	..	10,000	6,000	4,50,000
लिपिक वर्गीय स्थापना Ministerial Establishment	3,65,000	40,66,000	33,50,000	13,94,000	3,95,000	..	4,07,000	2,68,000	1,02,45,000
चतुर्थ श्रेणी कर्मचारी Class IV Servants	39,000	8,24,000	7,73,000	2,29,000	72,500	..	1,01,000	59,500	20,98,000
योग									
TOTAL	10,72,600	98,61,600	88,51,000	39,11,900	12,84,500	1,61,200	13,27,000	8,01,200	2,72,71,000

[No. G. 20017/3/73-HI]
C. A. GOPALAKRISHNAN
Dy. Chief Accounts Officers.
For Financial Adviser and
Chief Accounts Officer

नई दिल्ली, 4 जुलाई, 1973

of February, 1973 upto and inclusive of the 31st January, 1974.

[F. No. S. 38014(21)/73-H1]

नई दिल्ली, 5 जुलाई, 1973

का. आ. 2062.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि भारत सरकार के संचार विभाग, डाक और तार बोर्ड के कलकत्ता, बम्बई और जबलपुर के दूर संचार कारखानों, जो पहले तार कर्मशाला, अलीपुर, कलकत्ता टेलीग्राफ कर्मशाला, बम्बई और तार कर्मशाला, जबलपुर के नाम से जाने जाते थे, के कर्मचारियों को, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) के अधीन उपवर्धित प्रसुविधाएं जैसी सारतः प्रसुविधाएं प्राप्त हैं।

अतः, अथ, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 90 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 1717 तारीख 5 मई, 1972 के क्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम से परामर्श करने के पश्चात्, ऊपर वर्णित कारखानों को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से फरवरी, 1973 के प्रथम दिन से 31 जनवरी, 1974 तक, जिसमें यह दिन भी सम्मिलित है, एक और वर्ष की अवधि के लिए छूट देती है।

[का. सं. एस. 38014(21)/73-एच. आई.]

New Delhi, the 4th July, 1973

S.O. 2062.—Whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the Telecommunication Factories at Calcutta, Bombay and Jabalpur, formerly known as the Telegraph Workshops, Alipore, Calcutta, the Telephone Workshops, Bombay and the Telegraph Workshops, Jabalpur belonging to the Government of India in the Department of Communication, Posts and Telegraphs Board are otherwise in receipt of benefits substantially similar to the benefits provided under the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948).

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 90 of the said Act and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 1717 dated the 5th May, 1972, the Central Government, after consultation with the Employees State Insurance Corporation, hereby exempts the above mentioned factories from the operation of the said Act for a further period of one year with effect from the 1st day

का. आ. 2063.—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 17 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना का. आ. सं. 4007, तारीख 21 नवम्बर, 1972 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अथत् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची 1 में "5-भारत सरकार मद्रास-लय, गंगटोक, सिक्किम" अंक और शब्दों का लोप किया जाएगा और उसकी क्रम संख्या 6 से 14 क्रमशः क्रम संख्या 5 से 13 के रूप में पुनः संख्यांकित की जाएगी।

[सं. पी. एक. 2-5(5)/59]

दलजीत सिंह, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th July, 1973

S.O. 2063.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Employees' Provident Fund and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) S.O. No. 4007, dated the 21st November, 1972, namely :—

In the said notification, in Schedule I, the figure and words "5-Government of India Press, Gangtok, Sikkim" shall be omitted and the serial Nos. 6 to 14 thereof shall respectively be renumbered as serial Nos. 5 to 13.

[No. PF-II-5(5)/59]

DALJIT SINGH, Under Secy.